

Maj. Caleb Vance Haynes, Air Corps (temporary colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Jean Edens, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Emil Frederick Kollmer, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. LeRoy William Yarborough, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Edward Bernard Schiant, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Richard Francis Stone, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. James Norwood Ancrum, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. William Wallace Brier, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. John Brandon Franks, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. John Joseph Turner, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Richard James Sothorn, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Orville Ervin Davis, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. John Thomas McKay, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Percival Adams Wakeman, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Herman Jackson Crigger, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Floyd Thomas Gillespie, Signal Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Charles Homer Martin, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. William Henry Spedel, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Robert Owen Montgomery, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Sidney Frank Wharton, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Stephen Eugene Bullock, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Dayton Locke Robinson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Homer Banister Pettit, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. James Yancey Le Gette, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from March 8, 1942

Maj. Sherman Edgar Willard, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from March 21, 1942

Maj. Howard Samuel Paddock, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Harold Arthur Bartron, Air Corps (temporary colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Joseph Albert Sullivan, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. James Bryan McDavid, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Lloyd Henry Gibbons, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Henry Elmer Sowell, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. William Stilwell Conrow, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. James Webb Newberry, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. John Frederick Whiteley, Air Corps (temporary colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States.)

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from March 31, 1942

Maj. John Carson Grable, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Capt. Cleveland Rex Steward, Medical Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from March 5, 1942.

Capt. William A. Dains Woolgar, Medical Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from March 19, 1942.

Capt. Karl Rosenius Lundeborg, Medical Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from March 19, 1942.

Capt. Arthur Herman Corliss, Medical Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from March 19, 1942.

Capt. Jonathan Milton Rigdon, Medical Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from March 19, 1942.

To be captains

First Lt. Raymond Taylor Jenkins, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from March 10, 1942.

First Lt. Carl Bennett Stilson, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from March 10, 1942.

First Lt. Harold Thomas Little, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from March 10, 1942.

First Lt. Robert Nathan Lehman, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from March 10, 1942.

First Lt. Louis Franklin Saylor, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from March 10, 1942.

First Lt. Raymond Bender Croissant, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from March 10, 1942.

First Lt. Richard Stirling Bolten, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from March 18, 1942, subject to examination required by law.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. George William Brower, Veterinary Corps, with rank from March 8, 1942.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be first lieutenant

Second Lt. Howard Brim Nelson, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from March 5, 1942.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Milton Omar Beebe, United States Army (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from March 24, 1942.

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Ralph Mark Reed, United States Army (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from March 10, 1942.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY

Capt. Jesse B. Oldendorf to be rear admiral, for temporary service.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 5, 1942:

POSTMASTER

Jess H. Miller to be postmaster at Natoma, in the State of Kansas.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 5, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Pierre de L. Boal to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

Arthur Bliss Lane to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

Boaz Long to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

Wesley Frost to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

Robert M. Scotten to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Costa Rica.

Avra M. Warren to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

James B. Stewart to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nicaragua.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

L. Metcalfe Walling to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Thomas L. Bernard, Atchafalaya.

Marble M. Rogers, Baldwin.

Amos V. McLanahan, Florien.

Clifton T. Bigner, Pollock.

August L. Chappuis, Rayne.

James L. Derouen, Welsh.

MISSOURI

Loiel Earl Barnett, Lancaster.

OKLAHOMA

Ruth I. Corbin, Delaware.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we pray Thee to quiet our hearts and strengthen us with calm and collected minds. In difficult hours while the ancient fires of the prophets burn clean and deep in our breasts, give us uninterrupted fellowship with Thee. No fever of heat can burn the soul that breathes the air or learns the ways of the Christ. Knighted in the midst of sin and woe as He went about doing good, He was inspired by the final truth and the final reality.

Confronted as we are by staggering realities, praying that humankind may be saved from the deadly fascinations of war, oh, do Thou reproach all shameful indifference and the superficial attitudes which are ever new and ever old. May we be aroused to the realization that although the world is one vast Calvary of human suffering, over against the down-

pull of the world tragedy there stands the tremendous upward urge of compelling principles which will live until justice and freedom are redeemed. Dear Lord, we would in breathless silence pray for our President, his Cabinet, and his immediate counselors; be pleased to give them health, wisdom, and vision in the solution of all problems; may they feel the inspiration of a united country. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 27, 1942:

H. R. 4179. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States.

On February 28, 1942:

H. R. 6470. An act to extend the time within which the amount of any national marketing quota for tobacco, proclaimed under section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, may be increased.

On March 3, 1942:

H. R. 793. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles D. Talbert, deceased; and

H. R. 5880. An act to abolish certain fees charged by clerks of the district courts; and to exempt defendants in condemnation proceedings from the payment of filing fees in certain instances.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an article from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., entitled "Strikes in a Crucial Spring."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an address by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, entitled "There Can Be No Isolation."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SATTIERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address delivered by me over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a resolution of the Senate of Pennsylvania protesting the construction of a dam on Clarion River which would destroy Cook Forest, one of the priceless possessions of our Commonwealth.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a few excerpts from letters from farmers on the farm-security situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a part of a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an address made by Mr. Eugene Casey at the Washington Day dinner at Fort Worth, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated that it will be three pages and will cost the sum of \$135. I also wish to include a statement made by Mr. Gere A. Howe, of the Amarillo Globe.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the morning press reports there is a likelihood that the Secretary of War may resign on account of his health. Our friend and fellow colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is mentioned as his likely successor. I

can think of nothing that would better please this House, and I believe the country, than for this honor to be bestowed upon this distinguished American. In character, experience, knowledge, and patriotism no better man could be found in the country to grace this position than our friend, JIM WADSWORTH.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an editorial which was published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer relating to our colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

SECRETARY OF WAR STIMSON

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I join wholeheartedly with my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] in his reference to our distinguished colleague the Honorable JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York; but may I state further in connection with the press report that the Secretary of War, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, may resign that I express my appreciation for the distinguished services that have been rendered by the present Secretary of War to this country. He is a great American and a distinguished statesman with an illustrious record of great public service in many important positions. I am sure if he resigns it will be strictly on account of ill health, and I trust that the House of Representatives will understand that if his advices had been followed in 1931 when Japan first ruthlessly and wantonly started her regime of world conquest and entered Manchuria in violation of numerous treaties, obligations and set out to conquer the world, we would probably have been relieved of the present war situation, and peaceful China would not have been so severely during the past several tragic years, nor would we be now engaged in war on distant fronts in many parts of the world. If Secretary Stimson should resign I desire him to know that so far as I am concerned he will return to the shades of private life with my warmest esteem and gratitude to a great public servant, and I am sure he has the confidence of all our people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an address I made to the people of the State of Vermont 24 years ago today, and also to include an address which I made on the 3d day of March this year. May I say in reference to the matter just referred to on the floor that while I doubt that the gentleman most interested, perhaps, has

been advised with respect to the possibilities to which the press refers, and I am not undertaking nor assuming, as a Republican, to dictate to a Democratic President his choice as to a member of his Cabinet, however, and if the very distinguished gentleman who now holds the office is constrained to resign, no more able, nor better qualified individual can be found in the United States of America to succeed him than the gentleman who was mentioned in the press dispatches, our colleague and friend, Mr. WADSWORTH, of New York, as a possible successor to that distinguished Secretary of War, Henry Lewis Stimson.

I do not need to refer to the long legislative experience of our colleague, Mr. WADSWORTH, in the United States Senate, nor to his chairmanship of the Military Affairs Committee of that body, nor to the preeminence of the position he occupied there as a leader in the Senate. We in the House have seen him in action. That is the complete answer.

I speak impromptu and extemporaneously, yet I assert that his interest in all things and his information pertaining to national defense and the War Department is such that his statements reach the people as authoritative, backed by judgment, experience, and knowledge.

The people rely on him because of his demonstrated capacity, his wealth of experience, and it is true that what the gentleman from New York, JIM WADSWORTH, says the people believe, and rightly so.

That may sound like a tribute, yet it is true.

He compels confidence, and because—though he would be the last to admit it—he does not talk for effect—nor unless he knows what he is talking about from “a” to zero. The people know it. That is the answer these days.

If there is to be a change, he is the man—if the people are to be served.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WINTER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to answer that kiss of death the gentleman from Kansas has just administered to the Faddis committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks

in the RECORD and to include therein copies of certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the chairman of the committee on agriculture of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, to show that the Navy may have followed a wise course in extending the period of rest of Lieutenant Roosevelt 30 days, that immediate return to service may be dangerous let me read from a letter written prior to the time that the Roosevelt incident was called to the attention of the House. This man, an old friend, Fred Hildebrand, writes:

DEAR CLARE: I am writing you this letter in regard to my son-in-law who was drafted into the Army November 24, 1941. The first day he went to Camp Custer he had an attack of appendicitis and they operated on him the first night. He was in the hospital for 17 days and was out of the hospital only a few days until they made him march to Battle Creek. We thought they would send him home for a while to rest up after the operation, but instead they sent him to California on December 20, 1941. This trip and the marching he had to do so soon after the operation was too much for him, and when he got to California he had to go to the hospital. * * * He is in a rundown condition now and has lost 15 to 20 pounds in weight.

So sometimes it is a good thing to grant a few days further to men who have been operated on. This boy was not granted any time to recover. He did not have an extension of time and you are advised of the result.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PUERTO RICO

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in connection with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] had to say a few moments ago, I wish to submit these figures. The Department of the Interior Division of Territories and Island Possessions has informed me that since 1928, down to and including 1940, we have sent \$192,500,000 down to Puerto Rico; up to and including 1933 about \$14,000,000 of it and since 1933 about

\$178,000,000. Over \$75,000,000 of these funds have been used in connection with W. P. A., so-called Puerto Rican Reconstruction, social and agricultural experiments. At the present time that island is under the administration of Governor Rex Tugwell, who, I believe, was originally administrator of the movement to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred, embracing the Arthurdale project.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 33]

Arnold	Gillette	Osmers
Baldwin	Heffernan	Randolph
Barnes	Hope	Rivers
Baumhart	Houston	Robinson, Utah
Beam	Howell	Sanders
Bender	Jensen	Schaefer, Ill.
Blackney	Johnson	Shannon
Bolton	Lyndon B.	Simpson
Burdick	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Pa.
Byron	K'eborg	Stratton
Ciuet	Kramer	Sweeney
Cole, Md.	Lesinski	Tolan
Copeland	Magnuson	Vreeland
Culkin	Marcantonio	Walter
Curtis	Mason	Weiss
Englebright	Mundt	Whitten
Faddis	Myers, Pa.	Wolcott
Fish	Nichols	Worley
Fitzpatrick	O'Connor	Wright
Gifford	O'Day	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

FRED FARNER AND DORIS M. SCHROEDER—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 644)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3141, a bill “for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder.”

The bill proposes to provide for the payment of the sum of \$3,000 to Fred Farner, of Prairie View, Ill., as compensation for the death of his daughter, Barbara Farner; and the sum of \$5,000 to the guardian of Doris M. Schroeder, of Prairie View, Ill., as compensation for personal injuries caused by a Government ambulance driven by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The two girls, age 11 and 10, respectively, while standing on or near a sidewalk, were struck by an ambulance of the Civilian Conservation Corps when its driver swerved the vehicle in their direction to avoid a collision with two boys on a bicycle. It appears proper to ascribe responsibility for the lamentable accident to his failure to maintain proper control of the vehicle and to reduce its speed immediately upon seeing the children.

The proposed award of \$3,000 as compensation for the death of Barbara Farner appears reasonable.

On the other hand, the proposed payment of the sum of \$5,000 as compensation for personal injuries sustained by Doris Schroeder seems excessive. While the little girl suffered severe injuries and was in a hospital for a number of weeks, and lost a year in school, nevertheless, an investigation recently made by representatives of the Government indicates that she returned to school last September and is pursuing the usual childhood activities. The report indicates that she is making a complete recovery and has not sustained any permanent injuries.

Out of the proposed payment of \$5,000 the sum of \$1,500 may be allocated to medical and hospital expenses, leaving a balance of \$3,500 for pain and suffering. While, as I have heretofore indicated in connection with other private bills, it is appropriate to make suitable compensation for pain and suffering, in this case an award of \$3,500 for this purpose would appear excessive. If the bill would have provided for a total payment of an amount not exceeding \$3,000, instead of \$5,000, to the guardian of Doris Schroeder, and thereby in effect awarding not more than the sum of \$1,500 for pain and suffering, it would have appeared unobjectionable.

I regret that under the circumstances, I feel constrained to withhold my approval from the present bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 5, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the message and the accompanying bill will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6709, with Mr. RAMSPECK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday when the Committee rose tellers had been ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. The Chair now appoints as tellers the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 97, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure it is no reflection on the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, in view of the splendid work his committee has done on this bill, if some of us feel that there are places in the bill where substantial and appropriate savings can be made without in any wise hurting the real help to the farmer. I have studied the bill and I have read the hearings and the report. I know the committee had long hearings, patient hearings, and they have made some very splendid suggestions and some very appropriate cuts, but there are other places in which savings can be made. I hope the House of Representatives, wherever it can cut down on nonessential spending without hurting the farmer, will not hesitate to do so.

There are any number of places in this bill—you cannot go over them in 5 minutes, but they have been pointed out in the debate—where staggering sums are provided for transportation, for communication, and for personnel that are just stumbling over each other in the way of the farmer, impeding his progress instead of helping him, hundreds and thousands of them that could be cut out if we would have the courage to do it in this bill, and the farmers would applaud it.

The people of this country are becoming very conscious of what government is costing them. If you have any doubt about that, just go back home and find out.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. I will try to get the gentleman additional time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not care for any additional time.

Mr. TARVER. I should like to ask the gentleman a question which I think is very pertinent.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not care for any additional time. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have just refused to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

The situation is this. Time and time again in this bill there are appropriations that can be cut without hurting the farmer or what he really gets. I do not have time to mention all of them, but I have here a letter, the full text of which I shall insert in the RECORD if I can get permission to do so, in relation to the loans made in connection with the farm-rehabilitation program.

This letter is from J. C. Lewis, district supervisor of district four, Alabama, written just a year ago, March 4, 1941, in which he takes to task his field representatives because they are not producing the business. He says:

We have the money and we have the personnel and you must get out and get loans for the farmers and place those loans, because we have the money and it is a reflection upon our organization.

He further says:

We have ample personnel in this district to do the job that we originally set out to do,

that is aid about 4,000 needy families in this district. From the study of these figures I am enclosing, we are not planning on aiding more than 3,410 applicants in all. This is not enough for the personnel we have in this district. With the farm supervisors we have, counting two colored who will probably have a maximum load of 100 to 125, we should aid about 3,800 clients in this district.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when you have got to go out and reprimand your field agents because they are not lending the money to the farmers, when the farmers are not asking for such help. I am not a farmer, although I have many farmers in my district, but I believe I have a little intelligence about it. The farmer needs today two things. One is to give him a market and a price for his commodity. He has that because the world is his market. The fact is we should let him alone and let nature take its course. The best thing you can do for the farmer today is to remove handicaps and take away this management and this supervision and this Government patronage we are throwing around him day after day. I hope, as we go through this bill, we will curtail it wherever we can curtail these administrative expenditures and these nonessentials and bring the bill down. I believe the real farmers in this country will applaud our efforts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize the ability of the gentleman from Virginia and the fact that when he sets his shoulder to the wheel in the interest of any cause he will certainly be a force to be reckoned with. The gentleman from Virginia, however, has never been friendly to what is ordinarily referred to as the farm program.

The gentleman's efforts in behalf of economy are ordinarily efforts which should receive the commendation of the membership of the House and of the country. The gentleman handles, as chairman, the independent offices appropriation bill. It carried an appropriation of \$2,096,138,875. It was less than Budget estimates by approximately \$5,000,000. This reduction below Budget estimates is a thing which I think justifies much commendation of his subcommittee, but his bill carried three times in direct appropriations the amount of the appropriations that are carried in this bill, and the amount of reductions made by this subcommittee below Budget estimates is approximately \$2,000,000. So we should not yield to the gentleman from Virginia to explain to us the meaning of economy, since we have recommended economies in the farmers' bill that are out of proportion to those which he was able to effect in the independent offices appropriation bill. Besides that, our bill as a whole is approximately \$560,000,000 below the bill for the current year.

Economy? Yes; but I wonder if the membership of the House realizes—that is, if all of them realize—what would have been the effect of the amendment upon which we just voted a few moments ago with regard, let us say, to the agricultural marketing agreements. As it is

now, whenever the farmers of your community or mine or of your section desire to enter into an agricultural marketing agreement, and a great many thousands of them in the country today are interested in the negotiation of these agreements, the Department, from its staff here in Washington, sends an attorney to the field to contact them and confer with them regarding their problem and to assist them in the working out of their agreement. If you had adopted this amendment, which was proposed without rhyme or reason, as I see it, and I do not speak unkindly of those who thought it was justified, to reduce by one-half the travel allowance for the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Agriculture, then when your farmers in the next year might have desired assistance from the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Agriculture in connection with the working out of a marketing agreement, they would have been advised that the Solicitor's Office did not have sufficient travel funds with which to send men to the field and that therefore it would be necessary for the farmers themselves or their representatives to come to Washington in order to get the information and the assistance that they need.

Now, we are economizing here on the farmers. In the independent offices appropriation bill to which I referred awhile ago, and which was written by the subcommittee of our distinguished friend from Virginia, \$14,000,000 was carried for travel expenses and nobody rose on this floor to say that he thought they ought to be able to get along on half of the amount of travel expenses which had been estimated. Nobody rose to say that because this is a time of great national emergency and because the school children of the country are contributing to the defense program we ought to consider cutting out half of the travel expense carried in that bill.

We passed the State, Justice, and Commerce bill a few days ago. It carried considerable sums for travel expense, and insofar as I know—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Nobody rose on the floor to seek to cut out the amounts of any of those travel items on the basis of economy.

In a few days we are going to be ready to take up writing the Labor-Federal Security Administration bill. I am a member of the subcommittee having that duty.

We would like to know if it is the sentiment of this House that all travel expenses should be cut at least 50 percent? Is that what you want us to do? Do you want us to restrict the Wage and Hour Administration and the other organizations of the Department of Labor to 50 percent in the travel allowance, of what has been recommended by the Budget? What is sauce for the goose ought to be

sauce for the gander. I am willing to go along with you and economize in every reasonable way, but so far as I am concerned, I would like to know the basis for the economy, and the evidence which justifies it before we undertake to make drastic cuts in these amounts that have been fixed in the bill by the subcommittee, even below the estimates of the Budget.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. HARE. If the chairman of the subcommittee having in charge the independent offices appropriation bill, which was the first appropriation bill brought to the House, had established a precedent, reducing travel expenses in that bill by one-half, does not the gentleman think that with such an example, other subcommittees might have followed in his footsteps?

Mr. TARVER. I think, without meaning to be critical of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum], his position would have been much stronger if the independent offices appropriation bill had cut travel expenses by 50 percent, as he voted to do this morning in connection with the item which was voted upon a few moments ago.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I have about 12,000 farmers in my district. I grew up on the farm, and I know the hardships of the farmer, from the boy up. Is it not true that the reason why the gentleman from Virginia brought in such a large bill is because of the establishment of the bureaucracy we have in the United States Government today, and that the same thing applies to the Department of Agriculture in a magnified way?

Mr. TARVER. Without criticizing the gentleman from Virginia, I might say that there is much more chance for bureaucracy evils in a \$2,000,000,000 bill than there is in a bill such as this, which carries only \$700,000,000 in direct appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. It should be said in justice to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] that the nature of the bill that he brought in here as the first appropriation bill in this session, was one that did not offer itself so readily to curtailment as some other bills. May I remind the House that three-fourths of all of the money contained in the independent offices appropriation bill was in the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program and for the Veterans' Administration. That bill carried \$980,000,000 for the building of ships for the purpose of transporting lend-lease commodities across the seas. It contained over \$600,000,000, as I remember, for the Veterans' Administration. It contained \$33,000,000 for the selective service; but when you examine those agencies that perform no defense work of any kind, it occurs to me that the independent offices appropriation bill committee did a pretty fair job, and it ought to be said in all justice to the

gentleman from Virginia that he did a good job on those agencies where the element of defense was not involved. Obviously, defense items could not be cut when the Nation was clamoring for an all-out effort.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike out the last three words. While the independent offices appropriation bill did provide those regular appropriations that are more or less set, yet it did have expenditures for travel, and if he had singled out that item alone he might have made a comparison with the item in this bill. I said in my speech the other day that there are Members here who are so strong for economy at times that it seemed to me that they were trying to balance the Budget just on the agricultural appropriation bill, and that is just what is self-evident today. I have a better record for economy than has the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum], and I would like to say this: Cut out the farm security if you want to, cut out the farm tenancy, and I dare the gentleman to get on the floor and vote to cut out either of them. You might cut out some of these things that are put in the Department of Agriculture for the last few years, but I venture when the Interior appropriation bill comes in here providing millions for the Skyline Drive, down in the gentleman's district, he will be here to defend; but that could easily be done away with in a time like this.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, there are some things that should be called to the attention of the membership in connection with this bill so that you may know just about how it stands at the present time.

There were direct cuts below the Budget of \$1,994,000 and increases in reapportionments of \$1,013,000, leaving a net of a little less than \$1,000,000 cut below the Budget. But how does it stand as compared with last year? The items of soil conservation is reduced \$49,000,000. The parity payments item is increased, according to the way I figure it, with the contract authorization and full parity payments, \$140,000,000. The disposal of surplus commodities item is reduced a net of \$91,000,000, when you take into consideration the increased funds that are available under the Tariff Act.

The Surplus Marketing Administration is reduced \$35,000,000, and the item for loans in the Farm Tenant Act is reduced \$5,000,000. That leaves a net reduction of about \$40,000,000. I might have left out something, but not much.

There is a reduction of \$90,000,000 in the Rural Electrification Administration loans, but that is not because of any disposition to curtail that item, but because the Priorities Board has made such rulings that it makes it impossible to spend more money than that.

All of these Farm Security Administration items are not to aid the farmer. Neither are the farm tenant items. When we come to those there should be very careful and deliberate consideration of the items and they should be thoroughly discussed, because it is about time we got through fooling the farmers with

measures of that kind that do not help them.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. There is one thing that occurred that I think should be made clear. That is the difference in the amount of the appropriation as compared with the independent offices appropriation bill, when we take into consideration the fact that there is more than \$900,000,000 for shipping and more than \$600,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration in the independent offices bill. Now, what would be the difference in the balance between that bill and this one?

Mr. TABER. The trouble with this bill from the standpoint of what is the increase over last year is the fact that there is that contract authorization for parity payments, which will run from \$350,000,000 to \$400,000,000, and it does not show at all in the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on agriculture has worked for months and has done a good job in writing this bill. Someone, referring to the chairman of the subcommittee, stated yesterday that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] was the JOHN TABER of the Democratic side, intimating that he was given to conservatism and economy, given to saving every dollar that he could properly save of the taxpayer's money. The gentleman from Georgia has done a good job and he deserves our support. I do not believe the House of Representatives is in such an ugly mood that it will thoughtlessly and without rhyme or reason seek to balance the budget by oppressing and destroying the man with the hoe. I do not believe you are going to do it. Of course, there are many things going wrong in the country. There are many things that disturb and distress us, but that is no reason why we should endeavor to sabotage the program of the farmer. He is in the lowest income bracket but his work is of the highest importance to the life of the world.

I would call to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the fact that while the independent offices bill did contain money for needed ships, it must be admitted that food and fiber produced by the farmer is equally essential to the winning of the war. I do hope and believe that the House of Representatives will stand by this committee as a whole and will enable us to write a bill that will carry on this program.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] says that what the farmer wants is to be let alone. Certainly the farmer does not want the program for which he has worked all these years destroyed by this House in amendments to this bill. He does want what he has built up to be let alone and not torn down by one fell stroke by those who are not thinking straight and true in regard to this vital program of providing the machinery for assisting the program for producing the food and fiber of the Nation.

So I appeal to you, my colleagues, to go along with a program that is of the greatest importance to the national defense and to the security of our Nation, and to stand by this good and loyal committee which brought in a bill \$500,000,000 less than the bill last year, and made numerous cuts, some of which, perhaps, should not have been made.

I am for economy. My voice has been raised against waste and extravagance. I well know that all we have as a nation is at stake. I want to see further reductions made in this bill if they can be logically made. But I protest the efforts being made to destroy the program of the farmer.

The farmer's income is small, but his contribution to the public welfare is tremendous. He has never gone on strike or demanded a short workweek. His sons are on the battle fronts of the world. The farmer must clothe and feed them if we are to win.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Suppose we had let the farmer alone in 1933, what would have become of him?

Mr. MAHON. He would not be in the position he is in today to do the job of producing the food to win this war.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. In 1933 the farmer had no prices for his products. The gentleman does not mean to argue that if he is given adequate prices for his product he is not able to take care of himself?

Mr. MAHON. He is able to take care of himself, but there is an effort abroad to interfere and to beat down the price of agricultural commodities which we have been seeking all these years to build up. We have been working for parity prices. We have been trying to raise the price of the commodities on the farm, and now there are those who are so shortsighted that they are trying to destroy that which we have given years and billions of dollars to accomplish in this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that vegetables are vital to victory, and I believe that if we will give the farmer of America a square deal he will give the people of the world a square meal. I know that no Member of this House will question my friendship for the farmer. My record speaks for itself. I have voted for every bill which has been brought before this Congress in the interest of American agriculture.

I want to commend and congratulate the distinguished and able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] for his splendid efforts in trying to obtain and present to the House as much information as possible regarding one agency of the Government, the Farm Security Administration. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I regret very

much that we have not been permitted to legislate or to consider legislation regarding the activities of that agency. Following the enactment of the relief bill in 1935, the \$4,880,000,000 bill, the President issued an Executive order, pursuant to the authority given to him in that act, creating the Resettlement Administration and appointed Rexford G. Tugwell as Administrator, conferring upon the Administrator very broad and comprehensive powers. Later the President issued another Executive order which had the effect of further broadening those great powers which he had theretofore invested in the Administrator. As a result of that second Executive order the words "rural habilitation and relief in stricken agricultural areas" were inserted in the language conferring authority upon the Administrator.

The first time that the House Committee on Agriculture or the House itself considered any legislation with reference to farm tenancy was a bill which was enacted on July 27, 1937, which is known as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. At the time the committee was considering that bill it was brought to our attention that Mr. Tugwell had embarked upon a very ambitious program in the field of rural rehabilitation and in an effort to curb the activities and to liquidate some of the projects, the House committee reported this bill which was finally enacted into law in which it sought to bring about a liquidation of some of the projects which had been started by Mr. Tugwell, and provided in section 43 with regard to resettlement projects that the Secretary was authorized to continue to perform such of the functions vested in him pursuant to Executive Order No. 7530 of December 31, 1936, as amended, and so forth, "as shall be necessary only for the completion and administration of those resettlement projects," rural rehabilitation projects for rural resettlement purposes and land development and land-utilization projects.

We believed at that time that an honest effort would be made to liquidate those projects and that nobody would be audacious enough thereafter to embark upon similar projects.

It was one of the purposes of the House in passing that bill to prevent the Farm Security Administration from going into the real-estate business, from buying and subdividing and reselling farm property; but it was not long before we discovered that no real effort was being made to liquidate the projects, but that devices and schemes were being arranged which enabled the Administration to defeat the declared purpose and intention of the Congress and to continue its activities in buying large tracts of land and subdividing them among tenants.

We also provided in the bill I just referred to that the Administration could not deal with private corporations. That was done in section 46, which reads as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the making of any loan or the sale or other disposition of real property or other interest therein to any private corporation for farming purposes.

Now, the Administration knew that it had no right in law to acquire large tracts of land or even to acquire title to one single acre of land, yet out in Bates County, Mo., they purchased from Lord Scully of England 45,000 acres of land.

When I called the Administrator and made inquiry regarding this transaction I was advised that the land had been acquired or that they were in the process of acquiring it, and I called attention to the fact he had no right to acquire title to real property. He then advised me he was not acquiring title but it was a loan arrangement; that he was making a loan to an association composed of farmers. That association, of course, was created by the Farm Security Administration just to act as a "man of the straw" to take title pending the execution of the plan to subdivide it. I think the transaction involved a million dollars and the title to the property was vested in this fake organization or association. I understand that even after they have acquired the property and the transaction has been consummated for this huge tract of land consisting of 45,000 acres, with more than 100 families now living upon it and subsisting upon it, they have only had six applications for homesteads.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Briefly.

Mr. MAY. I get from the gentleman's remarks that they not only ignored the will of the Congress but actually violated the law?

Mr. COOLEY. I am definitely of the opinion that they have no authority in law to do the things which they have done. Not only that, but they have actually acquired sugar plantations in Puerto Rico for the purpose of subdividing. The explanation given in the record is that the owner of a large sugar plantation wanted to subdivide it, and the indication is he did subdivide it into small tracts; but the fact is, I was told by Dr. George Mitchell, of the Farm Security Administration, that that matter was being handled by an interim option. I asked what that was and who the person taking the option was. I was advised it was one of the officers of the Farm Security Administration who had taken the option on this big sugar plantation and the Farm Security Administration was financing the deal.

Mr. Chairman, I charge the Farm Security Administration with having deliberately endeavored in almost every conceivable way to defeat the intentions of the Congress as expressed in legislation which has been enacted. They say they have been advised by the Solicitor's office. Mr. Chairman, may I again say that it is unfortunate that the legislative committee has not been permitted to legislate regarding this agency? The fact is, I think the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee was rather surprised when he asked Mr. Baldwin, the Administrator, "Where is the basic law which enables you to do these things?" to discover that it was in appropriation bills which had been reported by the gentleman's own committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, he was told by the Administrator that the authority was found in appropriation bills which had been passed by the gentleman's committee. That is the fact.

Here is another thing I want to call your attention to. The laws of this Republic favor freehold estates and fee-simple titles, but, unfortunately, the officials of the Farm Security Administration do not favor fee-simple titles but rather leasehold titles. Down in North Carolina, according to the record, they have a communistic or cooperative farming community and they have issued a lease for 100 years, a lease to expire in 2042. Did you approve that? Did I approve that? Did anybody in the Congress know that they were purchasing property with taxpayers' money and leasing it until 2042?

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Briefly.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman realizes the fact that in the tenant-purchasing provisions they encourage fee-simple titles?

Mr. COOLEY. That is the creature of Congress, that is the thing the Congress did, and it is a thing I am proud of having participated in. I believe it has been free of criticism except perhaps the criticism that the administrative expense has been too great. The tenants will become home owners and they are being assisted under that provision.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I think it pretty certain that the committee is going to perform an operation upon this agency; therefore, the membership very greatly appreciates the light the gentleman is turning on in order that we may do a good job.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. I want to call attention to one other thing.

They have 12 families on a 1,557-acre farm in North Carolina in which the Government has an investment of \$288,862.04, or an investment in excess of \$24,000 per man. We cannot rehabilitate American agriculture if it requires an investment of \$24,000 in each person that we undertake to rehabilitate. There are 12 families operating this project. Each family has a community of interest in the 100-year lease, in all the work stock, livestock, and farm equipment and crops grown upon the farm.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will also recall that in our committee the other day a gentleman from the Department said it cost over \$30,000,000 to administer \$125,000,000 worth of land.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. Perhaps I am wrong, but if I understand the record, \$55,000,000 has been appropriated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, out of that \$55,000,000 apparently only \$10,000,000 is available for grants, and, according to my interpretation of the record, this leaves \$45,000,000 of the \$55,000,000 that will go for supervision, or wet-nursing, or whatever you might wish to call it.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has misstated the figures. The amount estimated for administration for the next fiscal year is \$7,150,000. If the gentleman will examine volume 6 of the justifications, on page 2 he will find in much greater detail than I can give it now complete information.

Mr. COOLEY. But you have an item listed of farm and home management assistance of \$18,705,000.

Mr. TARVER. There is also listed rural rehabilitation loans for 1943, \$73,508,000, and rural rehabilitation grants, as the gentleman has stated, only approximately \$10,000,000, or \$9,850,000.

Mr. COOLEY. But investigation of applicants is listed at \$12,533,204, and other items exclusive of loans and grants make up an excess of \$44,000,000, which means that this huge sum is being paid to white-collar workers, experts, or what have you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it may be possible in the interest of expediting debate to get some agreement as to further time to be consumed before we read the next section. If gentlemen would be willing to defer their remarks until a later stage in the bill, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, to which paragraph is the gentleman referring?

Mr. TARVER. The one that has just been read.

Mr. MONRONEY. Not the next one?

Mr. TARVER. No. It has not been read yet. I can appreciate the fact that gentlemen want to discuss certain features of the bill, but it does not seem that they should all want to talk at this particular time. They might defer their remarks in some cases until we reach the subject matter in which they are interested. It seems to me that would be proper. However, I do not want to impose my wishes upon the Committee. Unless we can limit debate to 20 minutes, I think we may just as well not limit it at all.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state specifically the paragraph to which he refers?

Mr. TARVER. The one which has just been completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph at the bottom of page 8. It ends in line 21 on page 8.

The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on

this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HOOK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I want to know whether I am going to get 5 minutes in this time.

Mr. TARVER. That is in the discretion of the Chairman.

Mr. HOOK. Under the circumstances, then, I shall have to object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the evident willingness of the Committee to fix some limitation, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI].

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, in peacetime a battleship may carry a number of comforts and fancy trimmings, but in wartime it must be stripped of all except the machinery vital to warfare. A ship of state in peacetime, for the comfort of its citizens, may carry a number of worthy objects, but when in war it, too, should strip itself to the bare necessities required to gain victory.

About a year ago the Secretary of the Treasury called upon us to cut non-defense expenditures by at least \$2,000,000,000 in order that our war effort may be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis, as far as possible. To date we have not accomplished anything materially in that direction, and it is high time we started. According to the President, it is up to Congress, and the people look to us for leadership to that end.

I appreciate that practically every agency in the Government considers itself a part of the defense set-up. Maybe it is related to the defense program in some distant manner, but we should give attention now only to those directly connected with our war effort.

The people of the country are calling upon us to streamline for the war effort by cutting nondefense spending, by suspending nondefense activities. We have been insisting that industry forsake its business-as-usual attitude. We have called upon the people to make sacrifices, to give their sons, and purchase Defense bonds. But, have we, so far, made any appreciable effort to curtail the Government's spending-as-usual program? Unless we do something definitely and materially in that direction, we will find the morale of our people adversely affected. If the Government does not set a good example, we cannot expect an all-out effort from the people. Some substantial reductions have been made in the agricultural bill under consideration. Have we cut it down to the bone so that some of its employees may be used directly in defense?

The bill before us provides for a number of very worthy activities, activities which in peacetime might be in order, but now we are at war, and it is our duty to suspend for the duration those activities that are not vitally necessary for our realization of victory.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this time to see if I cannot bring a little order out of chaos. First, we have two schools of thought: One, as represented by the Bankhead bill, says that if agricultural products bring a parity price there is no reason to dip into the United States Treasury for a subsidy. The second school of thought says that we will keep agricultural prices down and then take the extra money out of the United States Treasury, and we will be able to have the farmers under our thumbs and do as we want to with them.

We also have two schools of thought, insofar as food to win the war is concerned: We have one school, as represented by Mr. Henderson, that says that the way to protect the consumer is by putting a ceiling on food products. This is probably true, but with this program goes no assurance that we are going to have a continual supply of food for the people of this country. The other school of thought—with which I think most thinking people will agree—is that the best protection to the consumers of this country is to have an abundance of production. It is the safest course to follow for the welfare of our country.

We are not going to get anywhere in this food-for-war program until the time comes that our farm organizations, our Department of Agriculture, the Agricultural Committees of the House and of the Senate, and the other agricultural people in this country, once and for all, decide on what our war agricultural program should be. Our agricultural organizations are very well agreed among themselves.

Our committee has had several conferences with General Hershey lately asking his opinion in connection with labor on the farms during the war. I say right here and now that neither General Hershey, nor any local draft board, can be rightly subjected to any criticism until the agricultural people themselves—yes; until we as a Congress ourselves—have a definite food program so that General Hershey and the draft board can carry it out; otherwise we are going to end up in chaos. Our surpluses are being depleted. We will face starvation in this country if we follow false leadership in this food program. We will have all food rationed. The time has come when I think we should take a little time, as in the consideration of this bill today, to try to analyze what effect these provisions will have on the future of this country.

For example, I think I am as familiar as the average Member with the Farm Security Administration. I have followed their operations ever since they started. But if you stand here today and vote to abolish the Farm Security Administration, you must realize that you will be leaving stranded two or three hundred million dollars' worth of loans scattered all over the United States. We must proceed with care, caution, and common sense. We will be legislating against the best interests of our rural people. Can anyone deny that rural relief is not as deserving of consideration as urban relief?

We must approach these problems in a common-sense way or otherwise we are going to end up by doing much more harm than good.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, doubtless many mistakes were made in 1933, 1934, and 1935, but at least something was attempted, something was done and, generally, I think the country, and especially the farmers, profited by it. Mistakes were made in this whole rehabilitation program. I know that we must concede it. Many of those mistakes have been carried over from year to year, but let us not condemn the whole administration because certain mistakes were made. In other words, do not take up the exceptions and say that they represent the general rule, because they do not.

I am in accord with the views expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] that is insofar as he says he favors fee simple titles rather than leasehold estates. I agree with him, and if the Farm Security Administration is abusing the laws of Congress by going outside of the law and causing leasehold estates to be established instead of fee simple titles, we can, by a very simple amendment, prevent that. So let us stop the things that are bad rather than try to condemn the whole thing which will include many things which are good.

I know that the Tenant Purchase Act is being administered in a splendid way in my section of the country. I know that there are many farmers who are enabled to buy homes who would not be privileged to buy them were it not for that very constructive act of Congress. Did you know that payments on tenant-purchase loans are about the best that this Government has today? I doubt that payments on R. F. C. loans are as good or payments from any class or group as the payments are on the tenant-purchase loans.

The Farm Security Administration was criticized the other day because they advanced money to pay poll taxes. When the farm is in Texas—I do not know whether it is that way in other poll-tax States or not—you can pay your poll tax without paying your property tax, but it is a violation of law to pay your property tax without paying your poll tax. So this agency we set up to help the farmers pay their taxes where their security was considered ample were in the position of not being able to pay their property taxes unless they did pay their poll taxes. They were forced to pay their poll taxes in many cases in order to pay the property tax.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture has recently announced that farmers who have volunteer wheat must plow it up or be penalized in accordance with the farm quota law. We have, in the Middle West, thousands of acres of what is known as

volunteer wheat. It appears now that if permitted to ripen, it will be almost as good as the planted crop. I am informed it is estimated that this volunteer wheat crop may amount to as much as six or eight million bushels of wheat.

It just seems to me that a plan should be worked out so that farmers will not be required to plow under a prospective crop of wheat or be penalized to the extent of 50 or 60 cents per bushel.

Such a policy does not, in my judgment, fit into our present-day program. It does not belong in a peacetime program and it certainly does not belong in a wartime program. In fact, it does not make common sense.

At this very hour farmers are being asked to produce more food and to conserve more of it and yet, in the same breath, in order to comply with Government rules and regulations, farmers are ordered to plow up thousands of acres of wheat or pay the penalties prescribed by law. We are deeply concerned right now because it is likely there will be a shortage of farm help.

Mr. Chairman, there ought to be some way by which this surplus wheat crop may be saved. If it appears that it may depress the wheat market a little, then put it in storage until it is needed, because a time will come when we are going to need it and we will need it badly. Let the farmer, if he wants to do so, credit it against his next year's crop, that he may not plant or that, if planted, might be a failure.

Let him credit it against his soil-conservation payments and parity payments to which he may be entitled, and furthermore, we should in any event let him feed it to his livestock and poultry without penalty payments.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see any excuse, especially in view of the present situation, for penalizing a farmer who feeds his excess wheat to his livestock. The Government right now is emphasizing the great need for beef, pork, poultry, and dairy products. Farmers are being asked to increase these commodities in large amounts. That being the case, one of the least things that could be done is to permit the use of this surplus grain for livestock and poultry feed. All of the Allied Nations of the world are looking to us right now to furnish materials to win the war. One of the most important of these materials is food. Wheat either directly or indirectly comprises a great part of that food. You talk about stock piles of war materials, a little stock pile of grain is likely to be pretty important in the months to come.

Mr. Chairman, it just cannot be right when people in this country and throughout the countries of the world are in dire need of food when we, by rule or regulation, destroy a little surplus that we temporarily have on hand. Mr. Chairman, it is not less food we want, it is more food.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time when we gave credit to a farmer who grew two blades of grass where one grew before. It cannot be right that in view of the world situation we should penalize the farmer for doing that very thing.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of this country are among the most loyal of the American citizens. You can depend upon them to do their part in the prosecution of this war.

Our farmers are willing and glad to comply with the request that they increase their efforts in the production of food. All they ask is for a fair and decent price for their products on the basis of what they are required to pay for the things they buy. They will do it under the handicap of shortage of labor they will work harder and they will work longer hours in order to get the job done. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that people in all lines of work, everywhere, including Government workers, industry, and labor, are going to find it necessary in this very crucial period ahead of us to make more effort, to work longer hours, and to make more sacrifice in the prosecution of the terrible war in which we are engulfed. We are going to find it necessary to temporarily give up a good many of our peacetime events in order to see to it that our production is big enough and great enough to provide the materials and equipment that are going to be required in the carrying out of the gigantic program that is immediately ahead of us.

Mr. Chairman, along with this we are going to need a better understanding as well as a greater cooperation of effort in order to reach the goal of efficiency that is necessary at the present hour.

I plead for an understanding among all groups of all kinds of every walk of life in America for a combined effort in meeting the greatest challenge that our country has ever experienced.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INFORMATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department, \$490,144, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1943 for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of \$189,691, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal services in the District of Columbia, \$555,891; for preparation and display of exhibits, including cooperation with other bureaus and offices of the Department, and with Federal, State, county, municipal, and other agencies, and State, interstate, international, and other fairs or events held within the United States, \$70,832; for the preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, including cooperation with Federal, State, county, municipal, and other agencies, \$68,905; *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1943 from which transfers to this appropriation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1943, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the

District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding \$300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein, including personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of \$10,000 may be used for the temporary employment, by contract or otherwise, of specialists, technicians, and experts, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 9, line 12, strike out "\$555,891" and insert "\$455,891."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the second amendment, which I have sent to the desk, dealing with the Office of Information, be read at this time, and I shall ask also unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes on both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the other amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 11, line 3, strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, although I do not expect to; but am I to understand that certain Members are to be given as high as 10 minutes and 15 minutes each to explain their proposed amendments, when other Members will get cut down to 2½ minutes?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, certainly the subcommittee has not objected to the gentleman speaking, and I am sure that he will be able to get such time as he requires. I am sure the House and the gentleman will have an opportunity, and I hope my colleague's suggestion will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has done a splendid job as chairman of the subcommittee, dealing with agricultural appropriations.

He has worked hard and assiduously, early and late, for 5 solid weeks, mornings and afternoons. As I have said on a previous occasion, I take off my hat to him for his diligence. I think he is one of the outstanding chairmen of the subcommittees on the over-all Committee on Appropriations. We differ and have differed in committee at times. We have differed on some of the items, but I propose in the main to support the decisions taken by the chairman, except that I think there are some matters of policy on which there is a cleavage of opinion and there are some items that I honestly believe can be cut at the present time as not directly conducive to the welfare of the farmer. They do have some relationship to the farmer, but it is rather remote, and probably at this particular time we can dispense with these items. That is particularly true of the two amendments on the desk. The first one is to strike out \$100,000 of the salaries and expenses in the Office of Information, and the second is to cut the item for printing and binding \$500,000. They have 196 people working in the Office of Information at the present time. Some of them are high salaried. It occurs to me that we are not going to win the war with literature, and if these can be dispensed with or curtailed at the present time to the point where it will not seriously affect this activity, then the Congress in all conscience ought to adopt the amendments.

The item of \$550,000 for the Office of Information is expended for general informational work, for publication control for the distribution of agricultural information to the public. It includes an item of \$55,000 for the preparation and distribution of agricultural information to the press, and it occurs to me that here is an item on which we can all agree to some extent to some kind of a cut, because it is only on these dispensable things in which we can make a cut. We can safely take \$100,000 out of this item, and very safely take \$500,000 out of the item for printing and binding. If gentlemen care to examine the project statement which is included in the hearings, you will find that \$1,500,000—plus transferred from other agencies includes \$1,056,000 for job work. It includes a host of publications, such as *Agriculture in the Americas*; that little blue folder called *The Agricultural Situation*; *Annual Reports*; the little dodger called *Briefly Speaking*; *Congressional Documents*; *Consumers' Guide*; *Crops and Markets Bulletin*; *Experiment Station Record*; *Extension Service Review*; *Fire Contro. Notes*; *Farmers' Bulletin Lists*; *Foreign Agriculture*; *Forest Folders*; *Inventories of Seeds and Plants Imported*; *Instructions and Procedures for Agricultural Adjustment*; *Administration Journal*; *Agricultural Research*; *Monthly Lists of Publications*; *R. E. A. Notes*; *R. E. A. Instructions, Information, Service, and Regulatory Announcements*; *Soil Conservation Magazine*; unnumbered publications; the *Yearbook*; *Statistical Yearbook*. It also includes \$170,000 for research technical bulletins and \$395,000 for farmers' bulletins and leaflets. Surely, out of nearly \$1,980,000 for publications, we can squeeze out \$500,000, and

we can squeeze out \$100,000 from the salary and expenses account, and diminish safely the 196 people who are now working in that activity.

If this money is saved, you can buy two bombers and send them over to the Philippines. The boys in the fox holes of the Bataan Peninsula, according to press reports, have been taking up a collection of their own for the purpose of buying a bomber. Well, let us help them. Let us cut some of the money out of the Office of Information. Let us dispose of some of the printing and binding in this rather perilous hour and save enough money to send two bombers to the boys in the Philippines.

I ask that you support both amendments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very deeply the kindly remarks which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has made on more than one occasion concerning myself and the type of service I have been able to render, although I am unable to feel that his commendation is justified. I have simply done as have all members of our subcommittee, the best I could do within my limited ability in dealing with some very troublesome subject matters.

I have the highest degree of admiration for the gentleman from Illinois. In my judgment, he is one of the ablest Members of the House. He is sincere. He is conscientious. In endeavoring to bring about the adoption of this amendment making a very substantial reduction in the funds for the Office of Information, which the amendment contemplates, he is undoubtedly acting in good faith. Yet I feel the adoption of this amendment would be a very grave mistake—a mistake which would possibly be more injurious to agriculture than the taking of a similar amount of money from almost any other place in the bill where it might be done. This is the educational service for agriculture. This is the place where the farmers' bulletins are provided, the yearbooks are provided; where exhibits are prepared for State and county fairs. There are a multitude of educational activities which are carried on with the funds which are provided for this informational work.

There has been a great deal of ridicule in recent years of farmers' bulletins. Reference was made yesterday, possibly simply as a matter of good humor and not for the purpose of ridiculing the Office of Information, to an alleged publication some years ago of a bulletin called *The Love Life of the Bull Frog*. Now, as a matter of fact, that canard was exploded years ago by Chairman Buchanan of the full Committee on Appropriations, who placed in the House Record material showing that the publication in question was not gotten out by the Department of Agriculture at all, and was not circulated

as a farmers' bulletin. A great deal of this ridicule which is heaped upon the Department is similarly unjustified.

Some reference was made on yesterday to the Department getting out bulletins on the subject of Housekeeping Made Easier, and some other subject matters which would be of interest only to the housewives of the country. While we are endeavoring to help the farmers by furnishing them with educational materials I would see no objection to furnishing information, where we can do so, to make a little easier the burden which is being borne by the farmers' wives. I send out these bulletins all the time in my district, upon request. I have a district which is largely agricultural. I want to tell you another thing I do: I have a mailing list of about 3,000 boys and girls in my district between the ages of 16 and 21. I write at least 1 letter to each of those boys and girls every year. I invite them to communicate with me about publications of the Government which they may want. I send out to them thousands of those publications, including publications of the Department of Agriculture. Do not those boys and girls have the right, if they want to, to study the problems which are related to the farms on which they are living and where, in most instances, they will continue to live? Is that something that we ought to just undertake to cut out arbitrarily?

There are places in this bill where you can make cuts. Our committee has pointed out some places where, in our judgment, cuts could be made that we did not feel justified in making because the Congress had only recently, by legislative action, expressed what appeared to be its will as to a continuance of certain types of appropriations. Those economies run into the scores of millions of dollars—not just a comparatively small amount. If what you want to do is save money, may I not ask that you examine carefully portions of the report which deal with these subject matters in which the subcommittee feels that economies running into considerable sums might well be effected? But please do not destroy, hamper, or curtail the educational service of the Department of Agriculture.

It may be true, and I feel that it is true, that if we had facilities for careful examination, finding out just where economies might be effected, if we had say 10 men representing the House of Representatives who could at all times be in touch with the operations of the Department in Washington and in the field, and find out what is being carried on, we could effect economies and do it upon a proper basis. I feel sure, as a great many other Members do, that a great deal of money is being wasted. But when we come to economize I hope that we will insist upon having the proper evidence upon which to base economy, to determine just what money is being spent which ought not to be spent, and why, and not make a general cut, based upon nothing except our desire to economize.

Now, if you can secure a copy of the volume of justifications relating to the Office of Information I hope you will examine the numerous projects which are

listed and to which a portion of the funds available to this office are allotted. For example, \$100,000 is allotted to the Field Information Service. Does the gentleman propose that any of his proposed reduction shall be taken from that item? He does not say.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe that when we make a reduction on one of these appropriation bills that the Department will use the reduced amount for the best interest of the department? Would the Department necessarily apply the entire reduction to one item the gentleman might mention?

Mr. TARVER. I do not agree with the gentleman and I will state why, and in saying this I am not any more critical of the Department of Agriculture than I would be of any other department of the Government: Whenever you undertake to make a general cut and let them apportion it, they are not going to apportion it to the reduction of personnel. They may apportion it to the reduction of farmers' bulletins or yearbooks, or something else, but they are not going to drop anybody from the rolls.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. TARVER. No; I do not yield further at this time.

That is not said in a critical spirit, but it is something we all know is true of every department of the Government, not merely the Department of Agriculture. If therefore you are going to effect a saving, I think you ought to point out what you expect them to discontinue, what you expect them to curtail. Take, for example, the list of projects under printing and binding. There are 27 or 28 of them. They cover everything from the Consumers' Guide, to which the gentleman has made reference, to the production and printing of the yearbooks, insofar as that work is done in the Department, and various items of statistical information. They also cover the farmers' bulletins, and the production and printing of farmers' bulletins. The various amounts are stated in connection with each project. Now, just what does the gentleman want them to abandon?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman gladly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute in order to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MONRONEY. Since the gentleman is on that page in the estimates, matters that we do not have access to, could the gentleman advise the House as to the total cost of the preparation, publication, and printing of the Agricultural Yearbook? I have been unable to find it in the hearings.

Mr. TARVER. The estimate for 1943 for the Agricultural Yearbook in this statement is \$25,000. That is the expense item for this purpose, carried in this bill.

I may say to the gentleman, inasmuch as he says this information is not accessible to him, that it is accessible to him or to any other Member of the House. Any Member may have access to these volumes, six in number, I believe, containing justifications considered by the committee in connection with this bill, if they so desire. They are lying here on our desk. They have been in the committee room, and anybody who wants to examine them is at perfect liberty to do so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. RICH. In support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this country is at war. It is going to be necessary for every Member of Congress to do everything he can to economize in the regular appropriations. If I understood the gentleman from Georgia correctly, he said it would cost \$25,000 to publish the Yearbook.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RICH. As I understand it, each Member of Congress gets 400 Yearbooks. That means that more than 160,000 copies of the Yearbook are published. Does the gentleman mean to tell me they are published for \$25,000?

Mr. TARVER. Yes; I do. I wish the gentleman would examine the justification.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. According to the hearings the total number of Agricultural Yearbooks printed is 247,000. I just cannot conceive that this gigantic production costs no more than \$25,000. I am sure there must be some mistake or misunderstanding.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Georgia must be wrong.

Mr. TARVER. I am glad the gentleman finds the Department of Agriculture is so much more economical than he thought it was.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has referred to certain statistics, but I venture the assertion that when the item comes to the Printing Committee we shall find that the gentleman from Georgia is wrong in that statement.

Mr. TARVER. I want to give the gentleman the opportunity to examine this.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has a justification here that states it will cost \$25,000. Later we will find out from the Public Printer whether these figures are wrong. They must have misinformed the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is that not the figure for the Office of Information and not the figure for the printing and binding?

Mr. RICH. I do not know what they mean here, but I do know that you cannot publish that many books with the number of pages that these books have

in them for \$25,000. I am not gullible enough to think that that can be done.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman why they charge the farmer a dollar a book if the Department can print them for that amount?

Mr. RICH. Well, there are a lot of things this Congress does and no one seems to understand. Here is the point we have to get to right now. The gentleman from Illinois has offered an amendment here to cut down this printing bill. Certainly we can cut the printing bill of all these Government departments in half and it will not interfere with the farmers of this country at the present time. The farmers will be glad to cooperate in cutting down the expense of the regular appropriations of Government because the farmers are patriotic people, they are good citizens and they want to see this country win the war. We cannot win it if we are going to go ahead and by these regular appropriations for Government departments spend the money that we are spending. It just cannot be done. And where are you going to get the money? It is up to us to economize.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Am I correct when I say that the Agricultural Yearbooks for this year were not printed in the Government Printing Office at all, but are printed under contract—a bid contract—in Tennessee? If that is correct we should not have all this dispute about what the books cost. The figures should be immediately available.

Mr. RICH. We will get this information for you before the day is over, or we will see if we cannot get the information and tell you where the books are printed, how many are being printed, and what it is going to cost.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. My understanding is that the getting up of the books cost \$25,000, but that the printing cost is nearer \$250,000. That is what the hearings show, as I understand.

Mr. RICH. I just learned that 45,000 volumes of this Yearbook were published outside the Government Printing Office and that the cost of 246,000 volumes using over 1,000,000 pounds of paper was about \$150,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee will try to get us the absolute, definite information on the total cost of the preparation of the Yearbook, which was my question to him. It is my understanding that it exceeds even the \$200,000 and more nearly approaches \$600,000, but

I have not a definite figure to give the House.

I want to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I believe he is proceeding in absolutely the right direction. The gentleman has offered an amendment which would cut this item \$10,000 more than I had anticipated reducing the item for the Office of Information by an amendment I had planned to offer. If you will add up the sums made available to the Office of Information without the reduction proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], you will find that the paragraph carries authority to spend \$979,731. Now, that is pretty big money for a press agency. They will employ 170 for the coming year and employed last year 210.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee told us how hard they worked in preparation of these farm bulletins, yet the pages of his own committee hearings show rather plainly that the total number of bulletins prepared last year by this Department were only 41 new bulletins. The rest of the bulletin business is mailed out. Those bulletins, according to testimony before the committee headed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], continue largely without change from year to year. This famous housekeeping bulletin that was mentioned here as being of such great value, according to a page in the committee hearings, was revised in the twenties and has not been revised since.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to dig into appropriations, look into every one of them, and try to find where we can secure reductions. Any newspaperman will tell you that the newspaper publicity from the Department of Agriculture is not worth the paper it is written on. We can reduce this \$100,000, and the farmers of America will not suffer one single bit.

May I call your attention to the fact that in this information section there is a travel-expense item of \$29,200. To illustrate how these items have a habit of increasing, may I mention that this same Department spent in 1941 a total of only \$4,091 for travel. There is an increase of seven times in 2 years so far as the travel fund is concerned. A hundred thousand reduction as proposed so far as the Office of Information is concerned will help eliminate some of this travel fund that has been going into this bill. I hope the committee sees fit to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the newer Members here I have tried to be seen and not heard frequently since becoming a Member of this House. My attention has been called in this bill and others to the fact that on each occasion when amendment is offered to reduce any appropriation the distinguished chairman of the committee immediately will say, "Well, reduce somewhere else, but not here and now."

It so happens in this particular matter that it has been called to our atten-

tion that we should not cut down the educational program of the Department of Agriculture, that these items for which the gentleman from Illinois has offered his amendment have to do with the printing and publication of pamphlets, yearbooks, and things of that sort which go to the farmers of our country.

I may say to the distinguished subcommittee here that certainly we can cut out some of those pamphlets and some of those yearbooks, for this reason. My information is that we intend to have an army of about 7,000,000 men, who are going out of this country as far as participating in farming is concerned. Certainly one of the boys with General MacArthur in the Philippines does not need the distinguished gentleman from Georgia to send him a pamphlet on agriculture at this time.

I have been sending out these pamphlets and these yearbooks to the folks in my section, and I dare say that there is not a man who has received one of those pamphlets or yearbooks who would not be glad to use the same old book again next year and do without a new one if he could see this Congress bear down and reduce some of the items as we go along the trail. He is going to use last year's automobile and last year's tires; he is going to farm with last year's old tractor and last year's mules. I say to you that now is a mighty sorry time for this Congress to spend the money of these people trying to educate them how to farm, when we are taking out of farming operations so many people who will not have time to use educational facilities. They are not going to have time to try out a new type tractor because that new invention is going into the armed service.

In the consideration of this bill, let us consider a reduction of each item as we come to it, because if we do not do that we will be through with the bill and there will be no chance to reduce.

It was said here awhile ago by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, or the other way around, I believe it is. It is high time that we show the people of our Nation that we are going to cut out some of this sauce for any gander.

Something I have found—I think I have found—in the short time I have been in this Congress is that the gentleman's statement that no department of this Government is going to cut down personnel is accurate. It appears to be true. I say that any department in this Nation, unless it is the War Department, the Navy Department, or an agency closely connected with national defense, that is not willing to cut down the personnel in that department certainly is not patriotic, and this Congress needs to do something about it. Each two men in my section are doing the work that three men did last year, and I dare say that each Member of this Congress is doing the work that two Congressmen did 2 years ago or 3 years ago. It is high time for this Congress to determine who is running the country, whether it is these departments that refuse to cut their personnel during this time of emergency when men are needed in other

fields, or whether it is the Congress. I am inclined to the belief you will find that the departments are running this Government.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNS. I was very glad to hear the gentleman make this splendid talk with reference to the farmer. I think we can cut some of these departments about 75 percent. If these experts want jobs, we can find jobs for them on the farms of this country, and they do not need to work for the Government at \$3,800 a year.

Mr. WHITTEN. The same thing is true in my section, I may add.

May I say further that as far as I know, despite the great hardships that are being placed on the farmers in my section and the small business men, there is not one who is not glad to face the situation and accept what this Government is giving him, provided this Congress will demonstrate that it, too, is ready to cut down nonessential spending. Despite the restrictions on getting machinery parts and machinery, the restrictions on labor and the other restrictions we are placing on these men, and the automobiles and tires that are taken away from them, I have not yet had a complaint. They are glad to contribute their part. Let us contribute ours.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it has been well said that a well-informed people is the best security for America. It is also true that a well-informed farmer is the best security for America.

I have sat for 7 years on the Committee on Agriculture. Yes, I have some agriculture in my district. The great iron-ore mines and the great copper mines are there. Was it the copper miner who came here and asked to take agriculture out of the dumps, that asked for parity payments, that asked for subsidies? Was it the iron-ore miner? Was it the great industrial area of Detroit? No, it was the farmer of Michigan and the farmer of every State in the Union that came here when the country was running riot and wild and asked us to help him. We as a Congress did help him. I can safely say that in the 7 years I have been on the Committee on Agriculture I know that the farmer has been helped. The income of the farmer has been increased.

There is one thing you must remember. It might be good politics not to oppose but to go 100 percent down the line for every direct War or Navy appropriation and fight to the limit any other appropriation, but it is wrong economy. It is not the kind of economy that will win this war. If you are going to win this war, you will have to place in the bellies of the soldiers and the people of this Nation the food necessary to keep them going. You must do this as well as produce bombers.

It was said on the floor of the House that the boys in MacArthur's outfit were

collecting money to buy a bomber. I understand that General MacArthur says that is not true. It is propaganda, propaganda that is being spread throughout this Nation, to the effect that the farmer and those who are trying to help the farmer are not participating directly in the war program.

During the 7 years I have served on the Committee on Agriculture I have heard from the mouths of every one of them, and they are sincere, that our program should have as its ultimate goal a family-sized farm for more individuals, to bring to the individual farmer a family-sized farm that he can operate. This will be the basis of a really democratic Nation, a basis upon which to build actual democracy, instead of going toward the end of building up the commercial or the industrial farmer.

I assure you that the members of the Committee on Agriculture are studying that and trying to do everything they can along that line, each and every one of them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. NICHOLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. I can assure you that each and every one of them is endeavoring to help the family-sized farm operator and to make landowners out of tenants, but there seems to be the thought that if you strike from this bill the provisions for the Farm Security Administration you will help the small farmer of this Nation. The Farm Security Administration has helped the small farmer of this Nation.

It was set up for and is providing help to the low-income farmer, and if you are going to have an increase in production in this Nation, you are not going to get it from the commercial or the large industrial farmer. You are going to get it by helping the small farmer, and if the small farmer had been given the proper help last year, here are some of the estimates of the Bureau of Economics on the proportion of increase in war production of food. The low-income farmers could have produced, if they had been reached by the special credit program earlier in the year, 16 percent of the increase in milk, 35 percent of the increase in pork and lard, 40 percent of the increase in eggs, 12 percent of the increase in peanuts, 6 percent in the increase of sugar beets, 17 percent of the increase in soya beans, 46 percent of the increase in tomatoes for canning, and 97 percent of the increase in gardens. Remember that this huge production of vital war foods should have come from the low-income farmers who today are standing idly by without resources, without credit, without guidance, and unable to participate in the defense of democracy if you strike out the Farm Security Administration program.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has indicated, and I agree, that the farmer is in a better economic condition today than he has been for some considerable period of time.

Mr. HOOK. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. And the gentleman infers that some portion, perhaps, of that economic security has been provided as a result of legislative enactment of certain laws by this Congress.

Mr. HOOK. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman indicate to what he ascribes the increase in the price of farm commodities that the farmer is enjoying at the present time?

Mr. HOOK. To our Triple A program and the ever-normal granary.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman concede that the demand of the foreign countries arising out of the war effort has played a large part in the rise in the price of farm commodities?

Mr. HOOK. That has played its proportionate part; but if it were not for the program set forth we would not have had the fine, healthy condition of agriculture in this country today.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman answer another question?

Mr. HOOK. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman concedes, I assume, as one who has served upon the Committee on Agriculture, that today we are faced with a situation where we must have increased production of food?

Mr. HOOK. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Or we will be faced with the shortages that are prevalent throughout the world?

Mr. HOOK. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman agree with me that as a part of the program to achieve that production we must assure to the farmers of this country a fair price, first, for their products?

Mr. HOOK. Correct; a fair price.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask this question: Do I understand that the gentleman still is partial to the program of economic scarcity by which we sought to raise prices?

Mr. HOOK. Let me answer the gentleman there. If it were not for the program of Triple A, today you would not have had your soil conservation and you would not be in position to grow two blades of grass where one grew before. Those acres that were taken out of production, those acres that were conserved, those acres that were built up, now stand as a great reservoir to meet the increase in production that is called for by the Government and which the farmer should make in order to produce for the world.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman believe that those acres that have hereto-

fore been taken out of production and the fertility of which have been restored under the soil-conservation program, today, in the face of the demand for increased production, should be put back into production?

Mr. HOOK. Oh, if they are needed for the salvation of this Nation, yes; put them back.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman's information indicate, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, the necessity for employing in this country every productive acre of land in order to provide food surpluses to guard against the possibility of the inflationary tendency that the President and everyone else has pointed out as being imminent?

Mr. HOOK. It is my understanding that that problem is going to be reached, and it is my understanding that we are now in position, today, to see those facilities when they are needed.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman agrees, does he not, that, as a matter of plain economics, you never can have dangerous inflation in the prices of farm commodities so long as you have a real surplus?

Mr. HOOK. Right; and I believe an economy of abundance is the greatest economy for democracy.

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins, will he yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think, in view of all the colloquy that we have had, we ought to call attention to the fact that there are two amendments pending, one to strike out \$100,000 from salaries in the Office of Information, and the other to reduce the printing and binding item by \$500,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, let us get back to the proposal that is immediately before the Committee. There was a time in the early days of my service in this body—and, by the way, I am beginning today on my twentieth year—back in the days of prohibition, when any man who dared to get up on the floor of this House and raise his voice or hand in any way touching prohibition appropriations, or anything related to that same subject, was immediately labeled in league with the brewers and the bootleggers and the people who wanted to tear down the act. So it is today. Anyone who suggests that in this emergency—and I do not believe we really realize yet that we are in an

awful fix in this country—anyone now who suggests that we might cut off a few things here and there with which we might well do in normal times, he is labeled as being against the farmer. Gentlemen say that agriculture is important. Of course it is. It is just as important to feed a man as it is to put a gun in his hands, but you cannot feed him on farm bulletins, or on these experts down here getting up information in Information Service.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have not the time. We are right at this time in the midst of combating the Government departments to see where we can get personnel out of these various departments not engaged in war effort, and put them in the war game. Here is where you can get them. You can get them out of these departments, and you can take literally thousands of these supervisory-management-nuisance agents off the road that are traveling all the time, around the country, telling the farmer what to do. There were times when agriculture was depressed, and when it was necessary to send people out to help the farmer. He could not walk, he could not stand up; but today, all the farmer needs is to have some ground, and to put some seeds in the ground, and then that nobody should get in his way. That is all you need to have. Take the obstacles and the obstructions out of the road and let him work, and you need not worry about American agriculture or the farmers, they will take care of themselves and they will feed the world, as they will have to feed the world. There is no reason why in these bureaus in the Agricultural Department, and in every other department in this terrible emergency we cannot spare and pinch and economize a little. In every bill that has come before this committee, the independent offices appropriation bill, the deficiency appropriation bill, we have cut personnel and we have cut travel, and we have cut communications, and have even suggested working longer hours to do everything we could to cut nonessential expenditures in order to divert every penny we have and every ounce of manpower into war work. And there is no reason why we cannot now today, as I hope we will, cut out some of these things without any loss to the farmer or any loss to his importance in this emergency.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee that has participated in the writing of this bill and spent long hours in hearings, it is not only right and proper, but I feel it my duty to defend the bill as written. The committee has no feeling at all against any Member who wants to attack the bill or reduce it in any particular. That is both the privilege and the duty of every Member, if he believes that he can by such an attack better the bill; but every Member of this House must recognize this fact: Even though he has served here only a few months; that is, when a complex piece of legislation—and this is a complex piece of legislation—is written, it must be written in the first instance by a committee, and

if the committee has conscientiously spent days and weeks and months in writing a bill, and then he must confess that he cannot say that they know they are right in detail on every item, surely no Member unless he sees fit to make a study of a particular item, should ask an increase or reduction to it and be given serious consideration.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. No; I have not the time. As to these cuts proposed by a member of the subcommittee who participated faithfully in the writing of this bill, perhaps he is right. I do not think he is. He presented his arguments to the committee, and we voted them down, and while the matter was not presented in detail to the full committee of nearly 40 members, still the full committee O. K.'d the bill as a whole.

Let me show you what this would mean. First, remember this: This bill for the American farmer is cut 33 1/3 percent—one-half billion below what it was last year. When we take the transfers, this item is cut perhaps \$150,000. Now it is proposed to make a 20-percent further cut in the Office of Information, and a 33 1/3 percent cut in the matter of printing and binding. The break-down indicates that the printing and binding in the Department of Agriculture here in Washington, in order to meet the needs of this great agency and twenty-five or thirty million people engaged in agriculture, runs over a million dollars itself. If you cut half a million off of it, you would have nothing left for bulletins, for information, and about 6,000 extension agents throughout the United States, to get information to them; for yearbooks, and all of these other items. Now, do you want to do that?

I make these statements to point out to you how extremely difficult it is to arrive at a conclusion that you are doing the right thing, by either increasing or decreasing appropriations, unless you have made a full understanding of the subject matter.

I do not care how congested the city population which you may represent, I do not care what the background of your constituency may be, I assert that no man or woman in this House but must concede, that in our social order in these United States of America, agriculture is the most fundamental of all the callings we have. We could not equip or prepare an army, we could not maintain it in the field without agriculture. Agriculture is making its contribution beyond that of all those of my profession or any other group in America. This is a service to the farmers, that you are diminishing, in a critical time, when you make these unwise reductions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have gathered from the committee's table the record of the names and addresses of those farmers who have received \$1,000 or more in connection with the agricultural program. My attention was called to this by the remarks

of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

In looking over this schedule I find that in the State of Michigan there are listed nine farm operators who received as much as \$1,000, and one of those, the American Life Insurance Co., drew about 40 percent of the total amount listed, probably received on their collective farms.

Michigan stands right at the bottom on this proposition, while some States have as high as five hundred to a thousand farmers listed here who drew those large checks.

One other point: The Department of Agriculture has just informed me that for the House they are having printed 177,200 copies of the Yearbook, for the Senate 54,450, for the Department of Agriculture 15,000, or a total of 246,650, and that the costs are now being compiled.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I decline to yield. I have a letter from an important newspaper publisher, who makes this interesting comment:

In any controversy involving organized labor I am sorry to say that I believe there are very few dailies willing to express their honest views because of the possible unfavorable reaction among labor groups in their own field. In fact, a daily publisher told me this last Friday. It is, of course, easy for them to continue to ride the farmer for attempting to protect himself in the matter of increasing living costs but I have yet to see in a metropolitan newspaper a frank and fair discussion of the wartime labor practices and their relation to agricultural demands.

Incidentally, I think the farmers of this country have fed us, the parasites, for the last 15 or 20 years, at about a billion dollars loss per annum. For 4 or 5 months they have had, approximately, parity. When the housewife goes to the market today and finds one item on which she has to pay 145 percent of parity, she condemns agriculture generally and forgets that she is buying a great many items today considerably below parity.

So I am not too excited about how much the farmer is getting for his labor or how much he is digging the pocket-books of the American people today, for the farmer is certainly entitled to full parity of price.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel like making a real speech today, but I do want to call the attention of the membership to the very careful and well-informed remarks of the gentleman from Washington, Judge LEAVY, a member of the committee which handled this bill. It is one of the last speeches he will make in this House, because he is going to the Federal bench.

He certainly told us some real facts. He is one of the Members who has given most careful consideration and investigation to this bill. He called attention to the fact of the large decrease already

made in this bill as presented by the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, and his committee.

I think it is very ill-advised for those Members who have come recently to propose amendments to acts with which they are practically unfamiliar, and the effect of which they are not in a position to determine. They are not informed on the legislative history of the fight that we have made during the last 9 years to bring the farmer up halfway to a bright day. We remember, some of us, the conditions back in 1933 and 1934. It is the legislation that has been put through this House that has brought the moderate degree of prosperity that the farmer now has. The industrial East shares this farm prosperity.

I am going to vote with the Appropriations Committee. I sincerely hope that this Committee of the Whole will vote the bill as presented for I think it is the result of honest, hard intelligent study, after complete hearings.

I am sure that to cut out the Farm Security Administration or seriously to cripple it will do great harm. I cannot understand how we of Oregon could have taken care of the thousands who came out of the Dust Bowl, given them a start in life as we have, if we had not had the Farm Security Administration. Out of their broken lives the F. S. A. has made ambitious and hopeful small farmers. They lent them a few dollars; they got them a little land, and they helped them commence gardening and raising sugar beets and other irrigation crops. They successfully rehabilitated thousands. The F. S. A. has done great and constructive work in the Pacific Northwest. Any denial of financial resources to this helpful organization will be a blow to the underprivileged. The type of credit offered by F. S. A. is an essential part of our national system of farm finance and it does not duplicate the work of any other agency. I have received quantities of letters from farmers I have long known in Oregon, not just migrants, telling of definite benefits derived from the activities of the F. S. A.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] said about economy is only too true. We should have started our economy program 5 years ago. Some of us tried to do it but were not successful. While I have many farmers in my district, I could also claim it is an industrial district. It is about equally divided between agriculture and industry. I can go along and vote for this cut.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] said that when the housewife goes to market and finds that the price has been advanced on some one food

product she lays all advances in food to the farmer. When the farmers in my district send their eggs into the city of Chicago the teamsters over there just make them pay \$50 for every truck that goes in and \$5 a month dues. For every case of eggs we send, eggs which have been inspected by the State and Federal inspectors and sealed in the case within 12 hours before, we have been asked to pay \$1.10 to the union even though it does not inspect an egg. Why not place the responsibility for the increased cost of food where it belongs? We do not like to pay that tribute, that extra cost that the union fellows are adding to all food taken into the city for the privilege of getting our foodstuffs onto the breakfast tables of the city folks, but you fellows will not support any amendment that would relieve us from paying that tribute to the unions. I wish the farmers would organize and use some of the machinery and procedure that is used by these teamsters' unions and let the folks in the city go without their milk, their eggs, their butter, and fresh vegetables until they got rid of the racketeers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the gentleman going to overlook the move in Detroit now against their sending their livestock into the city?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure. The teamsters' union has been pulling that racket for some time. The only way farmers can get livestock to the market in the city of Detroit is to pay tribute to the teamsters' union. If the farmer has a truckload of cattle he cannot go there to the stockyard and deliver them himself to the jobber or retailer without being held up. The people of Detroit who depend on the farmers for their living will not even see to it that he has the right to use the streets of the city until he has obtained a license from the union, paid the union for the exercise of his right to pass over the streets of Detroit.

The unlawful action to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] just referred was brought to our attention the last of January and again early in February by two telegrams—the trouble has been of long standing and the pressure is increasing. The situation calls for action on the part of Congress. The action of these teamsters is raising the cost of the living of the defense workers by adding to the cost of food and it is denying a market to the farmers. The wires to which I refer are as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1942.

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

We have been requested to negotiate with the Teamsters' Union, No. 337, at Detroit, Mich. We have 71 employees eligible for membership. These companies requested an election, which was flatly refused by the union and a strike threatened for Sunday night. In order to determine for ourselves, a fair, impartial election was held Saturday morning with 59 against the union, 3 for, and 9 absent. A strike and violence is still threatened for Sunday night, February 1. Approximately 80 percent of the livestock for the city of Detroit passes through these yards. We supply packing houses who deliver to Army

camp and stations. Around 1,500 individual trucks deliver livestock to this stockyard weekly. Stopping these trucks will deprive 70,000 farmers of an outlet for their livestock. We have no objection to dealing with a union that represents our employees. We should, however, not be coerced into forcing them into a union they do not want.

A strike would tie up the meat supply of the city of Detroit. Your efforts on our behalf to prevent this catastrophe are urgently solicited.

DETROIT LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
J. J. KIDDON, President.
W. J. CHAMBERS, Secretary.
BISHOP HAMMOND & Co.,
RIDLEY & MARSHALL.
MICHIGAN LIVESTOCK EXCHANGE.

FEBRUARY 2, 1942.

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN,

Member of Congress:

Striking Michigan Livestock Exchange expect complete tie-up soon.

DETROIT LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
J. J. KIDDON, President.
W. J. CHAMBERS, Secretary.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman know that a truck driver who does not belong to the C. I. O. in New York cannot get into the city?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Without paying \$8.41 if a small truck and \$9.42 if a large one. And the United States Supreme Court said Monday the law Congress passed did not prevent that practice. Time we acted. Oh yes; and I saw in the paper, that even the Army cannot drive its own trucks through certain districts in the city of New York until it pays tribute to the union. Talk about licking the Japs and the Germans. Apparently this administration cannot or will not lick union racketeers in the city of New York who are levying tribute on our citizens.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Did the gentleman say that a farmer could not drive his truck into Detroit?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right, if he seeks to deliver produce, until he pays tribute to the union.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Then you better move out to Kansas City. They cannot stop them out there. We live in a different land.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments be voted on together.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object to that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection, because they relate to the same thing.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, if they are to be voted on jointly, I ask unanimous consent that the other amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the other amendment be again reported. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the second amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that the two amendments be considered together?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois on page 9, line 12.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER and Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 93, noes 56.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Page 1, line 16, after "\$70,832", strike out all down to the colon following "\$68,905."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I understand there is another amendment pending. I do not want to interfere with the action on that amendment, but I do desire my amendment to be submitted for vote after this other amendment has been disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no other amendment pending.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. The second Dirksen amendment is still pending. There was objection to voting on the two amendments together.

The CHAIRMAN. The second amendment, offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], is to another paragraph of the bill, namely, page 11. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], as I understand it, is to the paragraph upon which debate has been closed by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is correct. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] because the committee has closed debate on this paragraph.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRINTING AND BINDING

For all printing and binding for the Department of Agriculture, including all of its

bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located in Washington, District of Columbia, and elsewhere, except as otherwise in this act provided, \$1,500,000, including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, as required by the acts of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212-220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108), and in pursuance of the act approved March 30, 1906 (44 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed \$250,000 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct, but not including work done at the field printing plants of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, in accordance with the act approved March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220): *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer to this appropriation from the appropriation made for "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources" such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and from funds appropriated to carry into effect the terms of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under said section 32, and from funds appropriated for parity payments under section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with such payments: *Provided further*, That the total amount that may be transferred under the authority granted in the preceding proviso shall not exceed \$550,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 11, line 3, strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the whole time except to say that this matter has been thoroughly discussed. This is a companion amendment to the one just adopted by the committee and strikes out an additional \$500,000 from the printing and binding item, reducing this item from \$1,900,000 to \$1,400,000 in round figures. This should be ample for all purposes. I respectfully suggest that the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does not the gentleman believe that if there is in the bill \$1,493,109 for multigraphing and duplicating work, that that goes under the realm of printing and binding?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is all included in this item, in addition to transfers to other departments, and I believe they can stand this cut at a time of emergency.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. Chairman, I am not feeling badly about anything and I have a pretty good

record as far as economy is concerned. I note that my good friend from Illinois did not vote against parity, while I did vote against parity the last time it was an issue. Throughout the years my stand on economy in agriculture has been known to all. There is no bad feeling at all.

May I propose to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], that we enter into an agreement to accept a universal cut of 25 to 50 percent on every item in the bill, with the understanding that we will have a resolution introduced to go back and take the other three supply bills, except the Navy bill, and reduce them equally; then we will have an honest-to-God reduction and not the House writing a supply bill on the floor. We have not yet reached the controversial sections and are virtually rewriting this bill on the floor of the House on every page.

I plead with the chairman of the subcommittee to enter into an agreement to have a 30-percent cut on every item in this bill, send it to the Senate, and offer a resolution to go back and take the other three supply bills, excluding the Navy bill, and do the same thing. The gentleman from Virginia has turned on a lot of steam here. He wants us to start economy with agriculture and he comes to the floor with this proposition aided by other assistants today. We might as well accept it and send it to the Senate.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman ask me a question?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; I ask the gentleman to enter into such an agreement.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman's suggestion is very interesting but of course it would be impossible to secure economies in any of the bills which have been passed or in probably any other bill which does not deal with agriculture. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the farmer is being made the object of experimentations in economy in this bill. Although the gentleman and I are in agreement, and although the committee is in substantial agreement on both sides of the aisle, I do not feel that anything that the gentleman and I could do would prevent these other gentlemen from indulging in this experiment.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Why would not the House be willing to cut this bill 30 percent and not the others? How could the Members oppose a resolution to go back and cut the other three bills?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman does not realize just how shrewd these people are.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I would like to challenge the House and the ranking majority member of this subcommittee to do that very thing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Put the matter to a vote and we will accept it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure that the chairman of this subcommittee will tell the House that I as a member of the subcommittee have been reasonably diligent in the study of the measure now pending on the floor.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has indeed been very diligent and very useful. I am sure he is absolutely conscientious in his opposition. However, not intending to reflect on the motives of any other Member of the House, there are certainly associated with him gentlemen who are for the first time in the legislative history of this Congress trying to make some record in the interest of economy. I am not saying that the gentleman is in that class, but certainly there are some Members of the House who should be so classified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The thing I want to emphasize to the Committee of the Whole is that there is nothing capricious about these. I discussed them all in the hour-long speech I made the other day. They represent my best judgment, after 5 weeks of intensive study of this bill.

Mr. TARVER. I think the gentleman is absolutely conscientious and doing what he thinks is right, although I do not agree with him.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I am not being facetious. I think it would be in the interest of good government to have a uniform cut on a bill that we have recommended after study rather than to have haphazard cuts on the floor of the House. I appeal to you that it is reasonable to take a flat 30-percent cut on every item in this bill if the membership is bound to make severe cuts all along. I am embarrassed by defending our committee bill, holding a record for economy, by the minority side.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be an expert on the subject of agriculture, although a large portion of my district is devoted to that pursuit. My work in the Congress has necessarily been along other lines. However, I have tried to acquaint myself with the work and the problems of the Department of Agriculture.

I say to the members of this committee, and to the people of the United States, that we can, during this war, suspend the publication of this Yearbook and of all these farm bulletins and pamphlets that are cluttering up every mail that goes out of Washington and every general store and every farmer's kitchen throughout the United States. These publications are not indispensable to the farmers. If I thought they were I would not support this amendment. If in the face of the desperate situation that confronts this country we cannot afford to cut some of these things out, then it is high time that we stop prattling about cutting out nondefense expenditures.

Just think of it. Every Member of this Congress has delivered to his office 400 of these Yearbooks, weighing 5 pounds apiece, and made up of the best paper that can be found. One ton for each Member of Congress to send out to the people of this country. Many people love

to receive it, for it is a beautiful book. I dare say, however, that there is not a single man on the floor of this House who has been able to read that book or any substantial portion of it. I seriously doubt that the farmers of America will ever find time to read it at this time.

When I was out in the State of Idaho a couple of weeks ago I asked a large audience, "How many of you have received this new Agricultural Yearbook?" Sixty-nine persons in the audience raised their hands. This shows the diligence of the Members from Idaho in sending them out. I said:

Will you honestly tell me how many of you people have read that book up to date, or any part of it?

Not one person raised his hand. Fine and informative as this volume is, the point is that we can do without it during this war.

I do not get one request a month from the farmers of my district for any of these farm bulletins. I have thousands of them lying to my credit over there in the Department of Agriculture, and the printing presses are still going.

In every newspaper there appears the demand that we save paper, save paper, save paper. Every time you pick up the Evening Star you will find scattered all through it the announcement, "Save paper, save paper." Yet the printing presses of the Department of Agriculture must be running 24 hours a day to print, print, print bulletins, propaganda, books, and more and more material of that kind. That must be stopped now, in order that we can spend that money to buy guns and the things that are necessary to carry on this war.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We not only would save the money but we need the printing facilities and the men who work on them to bring about an honest-to-God effort in this war.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. If they mean what they say, we need that paper for the war effort. Let us stop it. I do not understand that there is anything in the gentleman's amendment except the proposal to reduce the amount that is available for that particular purpose, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If this amendment is adopted to reduce this item by \$500,000, which is about 25 percent, it will have the same effect on the Treasury as if 10,000 farmers went into a bank and each bought a \$50 Defense bond.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is a very fine contribution.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, I get the import of the gentleman's argument with reference to the Yearbooks and the bulletins.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. But does the gentleman think we should adopt an amendment cutting down this appropriation \$500,000 because it includes \$25,000 for the yearbook? That is all of the departmental appropriation for printing in connection with the Yearbook. Does the gentleman justify cutting out \$500,000 without designating the items to be taken out simply because he thinks the Yearbook ought to be cut out?

Mr. KEEFE. Let me say to the distinguished chairman what he knows I have stated to the subcommittee, of which I am a member, time and again. The amounts involved are so huge and the ramifications are so extensive that I deny that there is a member of this committee or any other committee that can scientifically make a cut; yet the cuts must be made in the face of this situation. That is all there is to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to submit a unanimous-consent request. We had some debate on this matter in connection with another paragraph and I wonder if we can agree on 15 minutes additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make this statement in connection with the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. The Printing Office is running full time, 24 hours a day, and last year it was unable to print the Yearbook and they had to have them printed outside. Forty-five thousand copies of them were printed on the outside. Now you certainly can save work in the Government Printing Office and can save expenses by adopting this amendment. You can save over 1,000,000 pounds of paper.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we have just been told as an argument against sending out this vast amount of printed matter to the farmers and the people of the country generally that this matter is not read. Of course, I think we should bear in mind that in this day of great shortage of paper there are many other uses for this vast amount of printed matter, including the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when it reaches the farm and the home, even though it is not read at all.

However, this is not a sound argument for us to continue to spend these vast amounts on unread printed matter. Sending out this stuff is a very expensive way of relieving the waste paper shortage for favored constituents. We should

pass this amendment which will trim down this vast expenditure for printing.

It has been suggested, possibly facetiously, that we must go back and cut other supply bills that have already passed before we make cuts in this bill. In answer to that suggestion we have been told that since we have already passed those bills it is impossible for us to do anything about them. Those of us who are not great students of agriculture and who are not on the Appropriations Committee, must follow the members of those committees and listen to their guidance very largely, but I want to make this suggestion to those who think we ought to make a cut, both in this supply bill and in those which have already been passed. In the past few weeks we have found that Congress can change its collective mind very quickly and effectively when it wants to, and secure reverse action on a bill that it has recently passed. I merely have to mention the Congressional Pension Act and its repealer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the General Accounting Office gives me these figures. The total cost of the 1941 Agricultural Yearbook was \$134,990, and there were 249,000 books put out.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman realizes, of course, that only \$25,000 is included in the item we are discussing now in the agricultural appropriation bill. The gentleman is talking about all expense incurred, including that outside the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am merely mentioning a particular fact.

Mr. TARVER. Yes; and I wanted to make that clear.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This means about 54 cents apiece for the Agricultural Yearbook. It is not a high price for the sort of binding and printing and paper used in making it up.

Everyone knows that very few people read more than a small part of this book. I dare say that some person who understands the matter could condense all in it that is worthwhile, certainly all that concerns the farmer, in not to exceed 150 to 200 pages. I feel certain the farmers would not object to this being done. It would give us a great saving in cost.

I am not saying not to print the book at all, but I am saying that it might be condensed in such a way as to reduce the cost considerably and not lose anything to the farmer.

The question is constantly being asked what is the justification for the reduction of expenditures. The real justification for economy is that we do not have the money. The statement has been made here on the floor that a saving of \$500,000 is equal to 500 people buying each a thousand-dollar bond. There is more to it than that. It is really equal to a thousand people each buying a \$1,000 bond, for the simple reason that we are borrowing a great portion of the money we are now appropriating. Let us not

forget that. Here truly is a place where a dollar saved is a dollar earned.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I was very glad to be enlightened by the gentleman from Kansas when he proposed that we make an agreement here to reduce all previous expenditures or appropriations, and including this appropriation, by 33 percent. It is rather surprising, when we look behind the scenes, to find out what this is all about. The remarks of the gentleman are to the effect that the Republicans are rewriting this bill by cutting all appropriations. I am going to chastise my Democratic friends and praise my Republican friends, which is rather unusual. I praise them for their diligence in being present on the floor of the House, but not for their diligence in wanting to cut down those things that are necessary to an agricultural program. They seem to be very diligent in cutting down the appropriations necessary to help the farmer. They are very diligent in being present to sabotage the farm program, because they seem to think the farmer will forget by the next election. Let them tell their farmer friends about it, let them tell the farm population of America that if this program is sabotaged the crime lies at their feet. It is you gentlemen who have sabotaged that program that is so necessary in the interest of a great Nation at war to save not only the farmer but every man, woman, and child from the onrush of paganism. It may be good politics for you gentlemen to vote 100 percent for every war appropriation since Pearl Harbor and against every farm appropriation after Pearl Harbor, but remember, if the farmers of this Nation are not taken care of, are not being given the opportunity to participate properly in this program, with the help of this great Government, then again you may have a Pearl Harbor in the agricultural program of this Nation. You will probably change your votes on appropriations again, as it was changed after Pearl Harbor. God forbid that we should ever have another Pearl Harbor; but if it comes because of a reduction in this appropriation bill, you can lay it to the Republicans on this floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say, in answer to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], to whose remarks I have just listened, that this subcommittee commenced its sitting on the 19th day of November, which was before Pearl Harbor, and the cuts which we undertook to make in the appropriations, which the gentleman has seen fit to criticize, were made before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, if in the interest of a great cause it is necessary to give up the Agricultural Yearbook, I say all right, but certainly we should first eliminate the thousands of useless, foolish, and self-laudatory publications put out by officials of this Government. Our brilliant, distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who recently spoke, would have a different story to tell if he had gone just west of the State of Idaho into my district, for there he could not have found an audience that would

have reported as did that one in Idaho. My constituency is intelligent; it prizes the Yearbook, which is in great demand. Possibly if he had been speaking to an audience of my political party, he would have told a different story. I must endeavor to get the surplus stock allotted to Idaho and Wisconsin.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There has been very little said about the 16,000 farm bulletins. Everyone knows that they are read. It teaches those on the farm how to raise things, and the only reason they have not read this book is because they have been reading these other bulletins, and they will get at this book after they have got through with the pension question.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I have sent out more bulletins this year than any other year, because the boys are being taken from the farms, and the old folks remain. There have been more requests for bulletins this year in my office than any other year.

Mr. HARE. And I would like to say that I have had more requests from my district for farm publications than ever before. I have more requests than I have publications to my credit.

Mr. PIERCE. I could not get enough of them through my quota and I have had to ask my friends from the cities to loan them to me. This is a much-read book. I cannot understand why there are so many people who have not seen it. It must be the fault of their Congressmen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just to say that there is nothing here that will cut out the Yearbook at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the Dirksen amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 92, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Office of Information, \$1,990,144.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit afraid of the temper of this House, when the Members get into a mood such as they are in this afternoon. I am not at all concerned with cutting items in this bill which provide for luxurious travel for the privileged gentlemen who work in the bureaus of the Government. I personally would be very happy to see some of them riding in upper berths rather than in staterooms and bedrooms on these

trains. If it is possible to use good, sound judgment in reducing items in this bill for that and like purposes, I am happy to go along with the committee. But I want to warn you against getting yourselves into the frame of mind where you will support any amendment that is offered to this bill calling for a reduction. You know the farmers of this country have had more lip service, not only from the Congress and politicians, but from the press, than any other class of people in the country.

I have heard it said on this floor this afternoon that the farmers now are making so much money that you do not need to worry about them. They can take care of themselves. I do not know in what sections of the country those conditions prevail. They do not prevail in mine. Yes; this year the cotton farmers down in my section of the country got a fair price for their crop, but it is the first time they have got anything like cost of production for 5 or 6 or 7 years. I call to your minds five straight droughts that struck the Southwest, when they did not get anything. Yes, we passed some drought relief for them. God knows they needed it. I have stood on this floor in this session of Congress and voted for legislation to protect the wage of laborers. I have heard the wail of the press and the wail of good men on this floor who are afraid we will take something away from labor which will reduce their standard of living. All right. I do not want to do that, but I only ask that you men do as much for the boy who raises the stuff that is going to keep the soldiers at the front as you ask for the men that produce in the factories. So do not, in your temper this afternoon, let yourselves be carried away that you will ultimately punish the people who supply the food that keeps us all going.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I just wanted to tell the gentleman from Oklahoma what section of the country it was where the farmers were so prosperous. It is the window-box farmers in the city of New York and other metropolitan centers.

Mr. NICHOLS. Well, maybe the window-box farmers are making money, but do not worry about the farmers of this country making too much money. Out through the Middle West figures recently published show that the gross income of the average farmer is \$900 a year. Is that too much?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I just wanted to tell the gentleman from Mississippi, to whom the gentleman just yielded, these so-called window-box farmers from the cities have been, all through this bill, supporting the agricultural appropriations as reported out by Judge TARVER.

Mr. NICHOLS. And I hope that condition will continue.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Hawaii: To carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to extend the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii," approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386-388b), \$67,500.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many years ago this Congress passed legislation to extend Federal grants to the several States for the operation of agricultural experiment stations in conjunction with land-grant colleges. In a series of measures—the Hatch, Adams, and Purnell Acts—and over a period of years these grants provided a total of \$90,000 for each State, regardless of size, population, or the degree of importance of agriculture in such State's economy.

In 1928, nearly 30 years after Hawaii had become a part of the United States, the provisions of these acts were extended to the Territory of Hawaii by special legislation. The act of May 16, 1928, prescribed that the Territory should eventually obtain an amount equal to that allotted to the several States, commencing, however, with a smaller sum, to be increased by an annual increment until the full amount had been achieved. The authorization thus provided was carried out in succeeding appropriation bills until that for the fiscal year 1938. The necessity for economizing wherever possible, when we were spending tremendous sums for other purposes, led Congress to continue the amount for the preceding year without augmenting it by the authorized increment. However, the amounts distributed among the several States were not reduced, and each State received the full \$90,000. In the appropriation for the next fiscal year the principle of gradually increasing the item for the Hawaii Experiment Station was adhered to, but the amount of the increment was cut in half. Again no reduction was made in the sums allotted to the 48 States. In the fiscal years 1940 and 1941 the precedent established in the preceding year was carried out—in other words, small increments less than the amounts authorized by law were approved. In the fiscal year 1942 no increment was allowed, but again no reductions were made in the appropriations for this purpose for the several States.

The appropriation bill now before us carries the same amount as last year and does not provide even a small increment in the amount appropriated for the Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station. In tabulated form the record is as follows:

Fiscal year	Total amount authorized by law	Total amount appropriated	Difference
1937.....	\$50,000	\$50,000
1938.....	60,000	50,000	\$10,000
1939.....	70,000	55,000	15,000
1940.....	80,000	60,000	20,000
1941.....	90,000	67,500	22,500
1942.....	90,000	67,500	22,500
Total difference to date.....			90,000
1943.....	90,000	67,500	22,500

At this rate the purpose of the act of May 16, 1928, is nullified, and Hawaii

will never achieve parity with the several States, as was intended when the benefits of the Hatch, Adams, and Purnell Acts were extended to the Territory.

The sums involved are small, and it is difficult to understand why such insignificant savings should be made at the expense of the Territory of Hawaii when no similar reductions are applied to any one of the 48 States. If there is a necessity for economy it would appear reasonable to expect that it would apply with equal force to all parts of the country and that the appropriations for experiment stations would be reduced throughout. The experiment station in Hawaii has been carrying on a very important function in the encouragement of diversified agriculture. It concentrates on food crops grown for consumption within Hawaii, to make the Territory more self-supporting in food. It does not engage in work pertaining to the major agricultural commodities raised in the islands—that is, sugarcane and pineapples—as these two industries maintain their own experiment stations. The small amount deducted from the sum authorized to be appropriated for the Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station hampers the work it is undertaking and postpones the day when we will be self-sufficient in food. Letters and wires from those charged with the responsibility of carrying out this program urge me to make every effort to persuade Congress to grant the amount authorized.

The program of the experiment station in Hawaii is especially important at this time, almost of vital importance. It is a pity the committee, earnestly attempting to economize where possible, has found it necessary to disregard the authorized appropriation and felt it necessary to save a few thousand dollars at the expense of the agricultural program of the Territory of Hawaii.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL RESEARCH FUND, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b, 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of section 5 of the said act, and for special research work, including the planning, programming, coordination, and printing the results of such research, to be conducted by such agencies of the Department of Agriculture as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate or establish, and to which he may make allotments from this fund, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia, \$1,150,000, of which amount \$700,000 shall be available for the maintenance and operation of research laboratories and facilities in the major agricultural regions provided for by section 4 of said act: *Provided*, That not more than \$5,000 of this appropriation shall be used to further the chemical phases of the soybean investigations, except the routine analytical work for plant production, now being conducted at Urbana, Ill., and such \$5,000 shall be avail-

able only for the expenses incident to the transfer of such investigations to Peoria, Ill., for absorption by the Northern Regional Research Laboratory.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 18, line 3, after "Columbia", strike out "\$1,150,000" and insert "\$1,131,788."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to take the time of the committee on what appears to be a small item, but this is a part of the travel expense that I pointed out on the floor yesterday totals in this bill in the amount of almost \$16,000,000.

It is a shame that our appropriation system is such that in order to reach the item of travel, or to find what the item of travel provided in the bill is, you must spend hours searching carefully through the Budget book. It is a big task to find out how much of these appropriations are being spent for Pullman rides, for junkets, for business trips, for conventions, for hotels, and food while on these trips. I think that eventually we should adopt a rule that would provide that the amount of travel should be carried in specific appropriations, because I know the men who have spoken in favor of the farmers on the floor today do not mean to indicate that they do not believe we can squeeze some of the water out of the bureaus downtown; that we cannot trim off a little of this big roll of fat that has accumulated in the bureaucracies down there.

I know I am violating one of the fundamental rules by opposing a committee and that in doing so I establish myself as being either ignorant or not having any right to question any appropriations the committee sees fit to report, but I do not think that should be the case in this emergency. I have yielded on many, many things to the wisdom of the committee because they have been searching for millions. In my spare time I have made a small search for thousands. My cuts would amount to about \$8,000,000 in the travel expense items of the Department of Agriculture which now total \$16,000,000.

The item now under consideration, this special research fund, carries a travel item of only \$36,425. My amendment reduces it by \$18,212.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask the gentleman how he arrives at the proportion of reduction he makes in these travel items?

Mr. MONRONEY. I just divide them by two.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman, then, has taken the travel items in the Department of Agriculture bill and arbitrarily cut every one of them 50 percent without regard to the character of the service that is involved.

Mr. MONRONEY. No; I have not done that. If I had it would have meant the offering of a hundred or a hundred

and fifty amendments. There are certain things such as essential services to farmers where the travel portion seems to be only \$100 or \$200 that I have not touched.

This amendment cuts this item \$18,000 whereas the total travel expense of the Department runs into many millions. I do not believe any prudent man would say this group of men either downtown or in the field should not make some sacrifices. Perhaps right now the Department should only undertake half as much or maybe let their representatives travel only half as much.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It occurs to me that if the gentleman has found a sound basis for making a straight 50-percent cut in the travel items that he should follow this further and make corresponding cuts in the functions to which the travel is related, because obviously some of these services will have to be cut where travel is inherently a part of the service rendered.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The thought I had in mind is almost too mean to suggest, but if the gentleman's logic is good, then because of the fact that your Dust Bowl has been saturated with water your research station in Oklahoma does not need over 50 percent of its funds this year.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe they use any money for travel in connection with that project.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do not mean travel; but I am applying the same logic that the gentleman has applied, that there is not now any necessity for an appropriation because of what God has done to relieve the situation in the gentleman's country.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sorry, but I do not follow the gentleman. It is just a question of whether we want to support this extravagant expense for travel or to cut it. It can and should be cut.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma is conscientious and I think he has got something. I do not accept his logic on these propositions, but would suggest to him something like this, and I am sincere in what I am proposing: That the gentleman offer a proviso to the effect that these Government people who travel do not travel by Pullman at all, but go by day coach. Many of them would not be so anxious to travel if they could not go in Pullmans. Why does not the gentleman suggest a proviso that they absolutely not ride in Pullmans at all? That would be showing a proper war spirit of sacrifice.

That would be a real war spirit.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Does not the gentleman think we should set the example and make it a crime for us to sleep in a berth on a train, in order to encourage these people in the departments?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. For myself, I do not use them often. I hate to pay the Pullman \$14 or \$15 a night. Let us have these fellows in the departments sit up at night. I think that would be a real and effective provision.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will not the gentleman agree that certainly there is going to be a cut in nondefense travel due to limitation of tires, cars, the rationing of airplanes and railroad travel of at least 50 percent during the ensuing year; that is, for nondefense travel outside the Government? If that be true, why is it not a fair proposition to make a similar cut in Government travel?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I think that is all right. This should prohibit travel in Pullmans and in the air and not more than 75 cents per meal any place. Such a rule would reduce travel automatically.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, Federal agencies generally are limited to the purchase of automobiles in the lower-price range, such as Fords, Chevrolets, and Plymouths. I am advised that production of Fords and Chevrolets has ceased. That may be true of Plymouths, too, and it may be true of cars of larger dimensions.

It is needless to say that the demands of the military for automobiles of all types will sooner or later tax the supply to the utmost. It seems foolish, therefore, for us to permit automobiles to be procured, either as additions or replacements, by agencies not directly engaged in military operations; in other words, by agencies other than the Army and Navy, unless the Army and Navy shall approve of such course.

There is no good reason that I know of why nondefense agencies should not be required to get along with the equipment already on hand. If it cannot be conditioned, then let them be laid aside. Perhaps a lot of them should be laid aside. Perhaps it would be a good plan for the Budget Bureau to ascertain where there is a surplus of vehicles owing to curtailment of activities as a result of the defense program and either bar their use or require their assignment to meet demands where their use may be thoroughly justified.

I listened to some testimony the other day where one Federal agency was using 306 cars and had a force of 491 people to use them. That is the kind of thing that is going on, and it ought to be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the membership of the House that if they will just leave the entire matter of travel to the Appropriations Committee, in short time and in an orderly way we will handle travel items in the interest of economy and good government and not by slipshod methods such as have been proposed on the floor of the House yesterday and today. I do not believe that I am violating a confidence by advising the membership of the House that an appropriation bill will be on the floor

within the next few days that will prevent any agency of the Government, except the office of the President, from buying or exchanging automobiles except with the approval of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

In the instant case, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is adopted, persons connected with research laboratories in this country and men doing highly important work for agriculture, men who are trying their level best to discover a method of bringing into existence a usable synthetic rubber and many other articles that are necessary for our well-being and the military protection of the country will be instantly stopped. There are only \$36,000 involved in this item and that is for the travel expense of about 500 men, more men than the entire membership of the House of Representatives. It seems to me a cut of this nature can be characterized as exceedingly shortsighted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONRONEY) there were—ayes 40, noes 46.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon I called attention to the fact that from figures in my possession it appeared that out of approximately \$55,000,000, \$45,000,000 was being made available for personal services and for other items which did not go directly to the farmers whom we are trying to help under the Farm Security program.

I now have before me the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and I would like to call attention to some of the items in it.

The first one is personal services in the Department, \$1,975,649; personal services in the field, \$30,989,405. Total for personal services, including the committees, \$32,965,054. Of the total of \$129,406,282, \$75,000,000 is for loans and \$10,000,000 for grants. If my calculation is correct, eliminating loans and grants, approximately \$45,000,000 is made available for personal services.

It seems to me that that is an outrageous situation. This is money we intended to go to the underprivileged in the rural areas of America, yet \$45,000,000 of the \$129,000,000 is going to white-collar workers and supervisors. I wonder if in some way this item may be reduced

without impairing the real worth of this program.

I am talking now about the Farm Security Administration. I may say that I have been a friend of that Administration. I have defended it on many occasions when other persons have attacked it. It does seem to me, however, that this committee should have found some way to find a better use for this \$45,000,000. That is a tremendous sum of money. If these figures I have read from the Budget are not correct or if my interpretation of them is incorrect, then I hope the committee will give the House the benefit of correct information regarding these items.

It seems to me that the farmers themselves would appreciate the efforts of this Congress if we should try to do something to see that the needy in our agricultural areas secure the relief we intend them to have.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, for conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, and for aiding in formulating programs for authorized activities of the Department of Agriculture, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; landownership and values, costs, prices, and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, either independently or in cooperation with public agencies or organizations, \$1,278,798, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1943 for such salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of \$2,178,372, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation not to exceed \$1,893,928 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia, including the salary of the chief of bureau at \$10,000 per annum: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1943 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1943, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That, in addition, the Secretary may, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this appropriation for the purpose of administering and performing the functions of the Division of Agricultural Statistics of the Agricultural Marketing Service such sums as he may determine necessary from other appropriations available to the Department.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 21, line 21, strike out "\$1,278,798" and insert "\$278,798."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, you will observe that the Clerk has just read that portion of the bill which relates to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Its functions can be no better described than as they are carried in the language of the bill. Bear with me for just a moment as I read to you the purposes of the B. A. E.:

For acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, for conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, and for aiding in formulating programs for authorized activities of the Department of Agriculture relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production—

And so forth.

In 1939 this Bureau had \$802,000. In 1943, by the terms of this bill, it will have nearly \$3,500,000, or more than four times the earlier amount. It has on its pay roll today 1,141 persons, 766 in the District of Columbia and 375 in the field. There are over 216 persons in this Bureau today who receive \$3,800 or more. Here are some of the classes they carry: Economist, head social scientist, principal social scientist, social psychologist, program analyst, program relations officer, sociologist, and rural sociologist.

What are they doing in this planning agency drawing substantial salaries out of a total of \$3,500,000 for the purpose of carrying on advance planning in the field of agriculture? How is this money to be expended? Let me read you the language of the Budget:

For the economic research program, over \$2,000,000.

For regional and national development programs, \$854,000.

For cooperative agricultural program formulation, \$584,000.

They have set up area offices in the country, they have set up regional offices, and they made an attempt to set up county offices. If the thing continues, you will have a complete duplication of two or three different set-ups that now prevail in the Department.

Under this broad program, what do they propose to do?

To achieve production goals. As the gentleman from Virginia so well said, give a farmer a decent price for his product and let him alone and he will not need a lot of planning by scientists in the Nation's Capital.

Second, part of their program relates to obtaining required production. What

a paradoxical thing it is that they are getting ready to impose a wheat referendum on the farmers of the country, yet here is a planning agency proposing to spend \$3,500,000, among other things to procure and obtain the required production goals.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is this the same group of economic scientists who figured out that there would be no sugar shortage and, therefore, the production of sugar in the continental United States should be reduced by 17 percent last year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. A portion of that probably went across the table of this particular agency.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. COLLINS rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield. I must finish this statement.

They propose to go into the field of distribution. We have an Interstate Commerce Commission. They have already had some meetings in St. Louis on this question of interterritorial freight rates. We appropriated some money recently for that same purpose. There is an interterritorial freight rate study now being conducted by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Must that work be duplicated by a planning agency?

No. 4 in their program relates to price control. Millions of dollars have been appropriated for Mr. Henderson and his agency. Must we duplicate that work?

They propose, among other things, to engage in the facilitation of industrial production, to evaluate the skilled help on the farm and to siphon them into the industry of the country, when the Secretary himself has indicated to the committee that there is an incipient labor shortage on the farm.

No. 6 in their program is the development of fiscal and credit policies.

What is the Treasury for and what are these other agencies of government for, if not for that purpose?

And, finally, they are going in for a broad program of post-war planning.

Now, how does this agency rate insofar as national defense is concerned? Here is a release from the Budget Bureau dated February 27, 1942. Do you know where they have located the Bureau of Agricultural Economics from the standpoint of defense priority? They have listed all the agencies of the Government in five classes and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is in class 4. That is the Budget Bureau classification. So let no one tell you that they are so important in the scheme of things and bask so high in the estimation of the Budget Bureau that they are an outstanding agency in the realm of national defense, because they rate class 4.

Finally, the American Farm Bureau Federation, representing 550,000 paid family memberships, which includes over 2,000,000 of the farm population of the country, believes that this agency has gone so far that it is beginning to plan the farmer out of existence, and they

have suggested and they have endorsed a proposal to cut this item by \$1,000,000 or more. They would like to see the regional offices eliminated, they would like to see the area offices eliminated. They follow the philosophy that if you give the farmer the right price for his products and let him alone he will take care of production.

So I suggest to the Committee of the Whole that here you can support an amendment which has the approval and the endorsement of one of the largest, oldest, and most stable farm organizations in the United States, with an active family membership of more than 500,000, and so I earnestly suggest the saving of \$1,000,000 in the planning agency known as the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was wondering if the gentleman thought the statisticians in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics had anything to do with determining the sugar policy of the Department of Agriculture or if he did not rather think that that policy came from the top down?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It may have, but what I want to point out here is that you will find \$1,278,000 in direct appropriations in this paragraph, and at the bottom of the page and the top of the next one, you will find, "together with such transfers as are made by the Secretary," and there are at least 25 transfers from the subordinate agencies in agriculture, aggregating \$2,400,000, which will be transferred to this account. So the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which will plan for the American farmer, will expend \$3,500,000. Adopt this amendment, curtail it by \$1,000,000, and they still have \$2,500,000, and that is enough money for any agency of the Government in the field of planning at a time like this. This Bureau was originally established as a fact-finding agency and it should return to those functions.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, if the work of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is not useful, if the farmers of the country would be better off by the abolition of the bureau, if it is to be condemned because some scientists are employed in the bureau, then you ought to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. It will, in my judgment, if adopted, substantially destroy the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and will make it impossible for that Bureau to function with any considerable degree of efficiency.

In expressing this opinion I am in accord with the views of a majority of the subcommittee which took evidence for a long time with regard to the work of this organization, evidence which is set out on page 310 and the following pages of part 1 of our hearings and which is too

voluminous in detail for me or anyone else to undertake to discuss under the 5-minute rule.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in his discussion of the provisions of this bill on Tuesday, indicated his very high opinion of Dr. Tolley. In the course of his remarks he said, as I recall, that Dr. Tolley was giving his services to the Government at very much less compensation than he could procure from private industry. In fact, if I am not mistaken, and if I am the gentleman, who is present, will correct me, I believe he said that Dr. Tolley could earn several times as much in private industry as he is earning as the head of this Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and that private employers had sought to have him leave the Government service and engage in their employment at very much increased compensation. He then is a faithful public servant. He is a man who is so deeply interested in the subject matters concerning which he is in control that he is willing to sacrifice, not just a small amount, but tens of thousands of dollars annually that he could have for his private purse if he so desired, in order that he may be able to carry on this very important work for the agricultural interests of the country, and we have his advices, the advices of such a man in the hearings here concerning the needs of this bureau. I think we ought not to assume that a man of the public spirit manifested by Dr. Tolley, who is not gouging the Government himself, but who is sacrificing for the work he is carrying on, would undertake to deceive the Congress as to the necessities for the making available of moneys for the efficient carrying on of the work under his jurisdiction.

Surely we can rely upon such a man. If we cannot, then I do not know upon whom we may rely. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics last year had \$650,000 more than is carried in the bill for the present year. The Budget estimate made a very substantial cut of \$365,000 below the present year's bill, and our subcommittee cut the Budget estimate \$50,000, so that, if you approve the sum it has placed in the bill, you will be approving a sum which is \$1,065,000 below what the Bureau had for the last fiscal year, 1941.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reaffirm what I said, that Dr. Tolley is an able man, but by the same token I thought Dr. Tugwell was an able man, but I did not agree with the direction his policy took. This is a matter of policy. This is not aimed at any individual.

Mr. TARVER. Speaking for myself alone, I would not want to mention Dr. Tolley in the same breath with Dr. Tugwell. I consider Dr. Tolley an outstanding and public-spirited man, who has been performing and will continue to perform, if given an opportunity, an appreciable and valuable service for the agricultural industry of this country. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in addition to the very substantial

cut to which I have called your attention, proposes a further cut of \$1,000,000—\$1,000,000 in the amount of funds which shall be made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. What does the Bureau do? Why is it necessary that its work should be carried on? If you have time to read—and I do not think you ought to vote against the estimates for this appropriation unless you do have time and opportunity to read—the statements appearing on pages 312, 313, 314, 315, and 316, outlining the multiple projects which are being carried on under the jurisdiction of this Bureau, you will get some faint idea of a great deal of the amount of the useful work now being accomplished under its jurisdiction, and I hope you will take time to do so. I do not believe you ought to reject the judgment of the committee who considered this large volume of evidence as to the necessity for this appropriation unless you do have time to acquaint yourselves with the evidence as to just what the Bureau is doing, and how necessary and vital the work is at this time.

I take time to read just the first part of their definition of this program as it relates to its wartime work and wartime program in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

WARTIME WORK PROGRAM OF THE BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

In outlining the program of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the coming months, first priority has been given all lines of work that make significant contribution to winning the war. Second priority has been given those lines of work that will make a practical contribution to the solution of major problems of the immediate post-war period. Certain research maintenance activities also must be continued to enable the Bureau to meet future responsibilities, which we cannot now foresee.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics can make many significant direct contributions to the war effort: American agriculture must produce and aid in properly distributing food and fiber needed by our Nation and by our Allies, and must provide raw materials essential to our industrial production program. The Bureau's first task, therefore, is to help agencies within or without the Department to plan the production and distribution of these strategic agricultural commodities. Closely associated with production and distribution of agricultural commodities is the task of aiding in developing a sound program of price control.

On the other hand, the Bureau can make many contributions to other phases of war effort over which the Department of Agriculture does not have immediate administrative responsibility: Farm people are serving in increasing numbers in our military forces and in industrial plants, and farm people are bearing their share of the war's costs. To speed up this participation of farm people in our war effort, officials of many agencies that direct national programs already are calling on the Bureau for information and advice.

I cannot proceed with a detailed statement of the facts as they appear in the RECORD and that are related to this activity, but I beg of the House that you do not undertake to supersede, by cutting a million dollars out of this appropriation, the conscientious judgment of the committee. If you want to do it, that is your responsibility, but I am very strong-

ly of the opinion that it ought not to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, not so much for the purpose of discussing the matter and trying to make a speech, but to ask for information from the chairman of the subcommittee, and also the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If I am not mistaken in what I understood the gentleman from Illinois to say, he said that there were some eleven hundred-odd employees in this particular Bureau and that of that number some three hundred-odd are in the District of Columbia. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a total of 1,141 persons in the Bureau. Seven hundred and sixty-six are in the District of Columbia, and 375 are in the field. Two hundred and sixteen of this number receive salaries in excess of \$3,800 a year.

Mr. MAY. The other question I want answered is this. On page 22 of the bill, after providing for the recoupment of certain sums as set out in the Budget, back into the fund, you provide that all of that fund of the total appropriation, not to exceed \$1,893,928, may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia, including the salary of the Chief of the Bureau at \$10,000 per annum.

Now, it occurs to me that is a rather large proportion of the total sum for salaries to those who are employed in the District of Columbia. Will the gentleman make some explanation as to why that is so large? Is it due to the fact that the salaries are, many of them, in the upper brackets, or is it on account of the number employed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, the gentleman should keep in mind that that is for salaries and expenses, so the larger part will be charged to the District of Columbia. Secondly, there are twice as many of their personnel in the District of Columbia as there are elsewhere. My whole idea is this, I do not want to see this agency, with all of its planning activities ramified everywhere in the country, for in a little while this appropriation will go from \$3,500,000 up to five, six, or seven million dollars, and it will never cease when all the area officers, district officers, regional officers, and even county officers in the interest of planning may be set up throughout the country.

Mr. MAY. It has been my experience that when you start expanding, the expansion is very easy to accomplish, especially when you continue to increase appropriations to pay for the expansion, so I agree with the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I do not happen to be a member of the subcommittee that considered the justifications for these appropriations. Therefore I

would make no claim to being familiar with details of any item and would have no superior knowledge of the facts upon which the committee based its conclusions. But I would like to call attention to this one point: If there is any division, any agency, any bureau in the Department of Agriculture that is contributing or will contribute toward the progress or prosecution of the war, it will be the Bureau of Economics.

Now, the gentleman who preceded me [Mr. MAY] Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, has made provision for hundreds of thousands and even millions of men to be assembled from every nook and corner of this country into military service. It is highly important to the enlisted men, and those in charge to know some time in advance where their food is coming from, and to know that they are to be supplied with an adequate supply.

The chairman of the committee has read a statement from the hearings. I am going to ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes to read part of this testimony, which to me is very significant, particularly in this emergency.

The Chief of the Bureau says:

The Bureau has been requested by Secretary Claude R. Wickard to take the leadership in formulating national wartime goals for the production of needed agricultural commodities. Formulation of these goals is a Department-wide effort in which Bureau representatives will work with commodity, marketing, and credit experts of other agencies.

National wartime production goals must be established on the basis of estimates of domestic and foreign requirements, and in the light of existing supplies of these agricultural commodities and the country's capacity to produce additional supplies.

4. Obtaining the participation of the farmer: If the Nation is to insure increased production of required agricultural commodities and support for other phases of the war program, it is essential that farmers understand and subscribe to the objectives of the Nation's program. In order that the Department of Agriculture may be able to take effective steps in presenting its program to local groups and in adapting it to local situations, it will be necessary, first of all, to determine for specific areas the character of any barriers to full participation. This information will be obtained through: (a) Surveys of farmer reaction to the production program and other phases of the war effort, and (b) analysis of conditions determining farmer participation in the war program. On the basis of information derived from these two sources, recommendations can be made regarding the procedure to be followed in setting up the Nation's war program in various problem areas.

I have an idea that in 6 months, or 12 months from now, our armed forces, or those in charge, would like to know the surplus amount of wheat in this country, the amount of corn, the quantity of beans, fruits, vegetables, meats, and other foodstuffs available for domestic requirements, foreign requirements, and for the armed forces. Suppose there would be nobody prepared to furnish that information, what would be the situation? It appears to me that if I were planning the fighting program for two or three million men, I would want to know 6 months or a year in advance

whether these supplies were going to be available and where. This war may continue for 3 years; it may continue for 5 years; or it may continue for 10 years; but, however long it may continue, we are going to need information in advance as to food supplies and food requirements for our men in the Army, Navy, and Air Corps.

I read a little further from the hearings:

To avoid dangerous shortages it will be necessary to anticipate as far as possible shifts in the requirements of our Nation or our Allies. Accordingly, estimates must be prepared continually of the food and fiber and other agricultural commodities needed for domestic consumption.

These estimates of requirements must be carefully reviewed in terms of the Nation's capacity to produce under conditions of likely returns to producers; shortages of farm labor, machinery, and fertilizer; present and possible credit arrangements; and processing, marketing, and transportation facilities. In formulating national goals, the ability of each region and local area to increase production must be considered.

The Bureau's work in this field does not end when the goals for 1 year have been established. Throughout the year it will be necessary to reexamine these goals in the light of changing conditions.

The people in our cities, the people employed in industry, the people employed in our workshops, the people employed in our mercantile establishments are going to want to know whether or not food will be available the next 6 months or the next year or the next 60 days. If not, then it will be possible for the different agencies to encourage farm production of particular crops so essentially needed. Of course, we know that farmers are going to continue somewhat their usual program, but there must be some planning to what supplies are available and where. We should have some idea about increase, if any, of eggs, poultry, hogs, beef, butter, cheese, fruits, vegetables, and so forth, and someone should know where they are. If this Bureau cannot get this information, I do not know of any agency in the Government that can.

I read further from the printed testimony before the subcommittee:

The Bureau's task is to give special attention to the production of essential commodities formerly imported from foreign countries.

Suppose we did not have anyone to collect this information—and if this amendment is carried, we will not have anyone. Suppose we did not know today how much wheat is available in this country and how much is available in Canada and how much is available in other countries, we would be planning this war with our eyes closed. We would be progressing in the dark, and our own men in the armed forces would not know 30 days ahead whether they would have sufficient food to sustain life, even, or whether they would be able to go upon a battlefield.

To me this is one of the most significant items in this bill, because, as I have said, it contributes directly toward the prosecution of this war; and if we do not have the information from this Bureau, as I have said, I do not know whom we are to get it from, and it seems

to me to be absolutely essential. Food is just as essential as bombs, tanks, rifles, machine guns, shells, or airplanes. To know where you are going to get food is just as essential as to know where you are going to get these weapons of war. Suppose our leaders or military experts today did not know where to ask for bombs, did not know how many to ask for, did not know how many they could call for, did not know how many they could get, what a predicament we would be in. Suppose, also, they did not know how much bread they were going to get, how much meat they were going to get, where it is to be found, who to get it from, and where it is to be assembled, what would be the situation? It would be tragic. I am greatly surprised that the author of this amendment, astute and able as he is, did not see far enough ahead to anticipate that if this country were deprived of information as to food crops, foodstuffs, meats, and so forth, for our armed forces, we would be in a tragic situation. Suppose we did not know where we were going to get planes next year, suppose we did not know how many we were going to get; suppose we did not know where we were going to get any tanks, or how many we were going to get, or how many guns we were going to get, how would we be able to plan and formulate the prosecution of this war?

How would we be able to formulate plans for feeding the soldiers or civilians if we did not know what it was necessary to grow, where it would be grown, where it could be produced in the shortest amount of time, and so forth?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The very leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation and those who were called to Hyde Park in 1937 to help operate the administration's farm program are endorsing the amendments that are on the desk. They are speaking for the dirt farmers of America.

Mr. HARE. I appreciate that. I have great confidence in the integrity and the ability of those farm leaders, but I do not yield to them the responsibility of making provision for the men whom we have thus far said should be drafted and sent to the front in the armed forces without first knowing that they are going to be fed, and where we can get the food. We may be able to get the information I have referred to without this appropriation, but no one has dared to say so. We may be able to get the information through some other bureau or agency, but no one has dared to say so. My feeling is that this information is indispensable in planning a successful fighting program in time of war, and not to provide for it from some source would result in sabotaging one of the most essential factors in the prosecution of a war, that is, a supply, an available supply and a knowledge of its availability.

Something has been said about the Bureau having State or regional offices, certainly. It has had for years in peacetime, and as soon as we need them in a war emergency someone wants to abolish

them. They are in a position to furnish the information that is not only necessary, but to my way of thinking is indispensable at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman limit his request to the pending amendment? I have an amendment I wish to offer to the paragraph and I would like to be heard on it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 15 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many are to be taken care of during these 15 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Three Members have indicated a desire to be heard.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that all debate on this amendment be limited to 15 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, somebody once said that the way to resume is to resume. Paraphrasing this saying, "The way to cut is to cut." I have never seen yet any bureau or any department of the Government that was absorbing, spending, and squandering millions of the people's substance which wanted to be cut one penny.

We have just read that the jaws of the Japanese pincers have been put around those of our armed forces fighting in the Dutch East Indies. I say that the jaws of a pincers have been put around the American taxpayers here in this country, and if we do not stop the onslaught that is being made the American taxpayer is going to become as extinct as the dodo and the passenger pigeon. We have sheared him to the skin and now we propose to skin him. When it is proposed to save a million dollars, gentlemen for whom I have genuine affection rise in their place in this Chamber, hold up their hands in holy horror and tell us that if we dispend with the services of 700 bureaucrats in Washington our armed forces will go without bread and meat. That just does not go over with me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Last year this very committee told the agency to return to its original purpose as a fact-finding agency, yet they have \$1,400,000 to scatter out in the field.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes. The farmer who has not got sense enough at this late date to put in a corn crop, plant it, keep the weeds out of it, then take care of it will not be helped by any bureaucrat on earth. People who do not know how to produce milk, butter, or any one of the staple crops upon which we are dependent for food and clothing are just not farmers.

They talk about the indispensability of having a horde of employees at \$3,800 per year here in Washington, 700 of them, evolving from their inner consciousness a lot of theories, like a spider spins its web. To say that we have to spend this extra million in this hour when everything we have has been put on the altar and has been brought to the verge of sacrifice just does not make sense. It does not add up. I am from a farming region and I operate a farm. I have sent out these bulletins and I have sent out these works on agriculture, but I know that there is not going to be a bushel of corn raised on the surface of one of these agricultural pamphlets or on the leaves of any one of these yearbooks. I got this last yearbook and opened it up to see what was in it, prior to sending it out to my home folks. I wanted to see if I was really sending my people anything that was worth-while. Now, I believe I have ordinary intelligence. I grew up on a farm; I know what it is to pull the bell cord over a mule and do farm work, but for the life of me, I could not see any information in that book anywhere that would help anybody on any farm in this country to produce an extra egg, an extra pound of butter, an extra hog, steer, or other staple farm commodity.

Let us stop and think what this million dollars that we propose to save means when translated into farm products. It means two million dozen fresh eggs at 50 cents a dozen. It means 10,000 steers weighing 1,000 pounds apiece at 10 cents a pound. And let us not forget that the farmer is going to have to pay his share of the taxes that are being laid on our people. Yet we halt and we stammer, we get all worked up, we get excited and make the statement that if we do this we are absolutely going to flabbergast and destroy the farmer, that if he has not an agricultural expert to come around and tell him what to do he cannot succeed. God deliver us from a governmental expert when he goes experting around.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe I can be classed along with the economy-minded group of the House, and find myself trying to locate places where we can save money, but we have hit a spot here where it is extremely unwise at this time to cut. I wish this Department had more money, more authority, and more responsibility at this time. Why do I say that? It is because daily we are being confronted with this talk

of sugar shortage, wool shortage, and food shortage. Mr. Leon Henderson is issuing probably 100,000,000 books to be distributed around with tickets for sugar. This House has not yet stopped to place the responsibility on any man to determine whether or not Mr. Leon Henderson's findings are correct or to provide a remedy or to begin the preparation of a remedy for that situation.

We are going along slaughtering thousands and thousands of lambs every week and crying "wool shortage." They say they are going to cut the pockets off your clothes; they are going to cut an inch off your pants. Mr. Chairman, we will hardly need our pockets after March 15. But I can get along better without my lamb chops than I can without my pants. Somebody should be responsible for looking for some method of remedying this situation. There is hardly a State in the Union that is not capable of producing sugar, and there are very few States that are unable to produce wool. Food is abundant throughout this Nation. Yet we take it lying down when Mr. Henderson says, "We are short of food; we are short of sugar; we are short of wool." And no one seems to be doing anything about it. Let us start relieving some of these emergencies.

In my opinion, the American people can take whatever is necessary for them to take to win this war. If need be, they can do without sugar and all these other things that I mentioned. But let us not monkey with them, let us be genuine about this thing, and let us place in the hands of somebody not only the responsibility for finding this out but the responsibility of offering a solution to it. I think that is good cornfield sense. If we are facing a shortage and if we know it is going to bring about a bad situation, why should we not begin not next year but now? Spring is coming on. Our crops are being planted. Our sugar crop has to be planted; the wool has to be grown. Yet here we are talking about cutting out a part of the appropriation that is set up for the only agricultural fact-finding agency which we have in this Nation that you can absolutely rely on. I think this is the wrong place to begin to clip.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, it almost seems a useless procedure to come down into the Well of this House to defend anything in connection with this agricultural appropriation bill. Six years I have been here. Six years I have helped write this bill. For 5 years I have found the Congress on both sides of the aisle quite sympathetic to the problems of the American farmer. However, since we commenced the reading of this bill yesterday, on both sides of the aisle, probably with more of a charge to my good Republican friends and my Democratic friends, the bill has been sniped at and shot at and torn to pieces already, without substantial reason.

Here is a cut suggested by one of the members of the subcommittee who helped write the bill. He presents his reasons. Summed up briefly, they are that in his judgment the services provided for can be dispensed with.

This is not partisan in the slightest. We are in a war now, and we have changed our economy entirely in the last 6 months, or are in the process of going into a war economy. The change will be terrific, and if not wisely carried on we face the danger of losing all we hold dear in government.

We have proceeded since the last war period, when agriculture learned the bitter lesson of not giving consideration to changing from a peacetime to a wartime economy and found itself bankrupt, with trying to do something for agriculture. Both parties have endeavored to cure post-war errors—the Republican Party in its various programs up to 1932, but with no success whatever and agriculture was finally prostrated. Since 1933 the Democratic Party has been instituting its program, and no one can deny but that great good has come from it. We have made mistakes since then, a lot of them. Every piece of legislation that has been passed in reference to the farmer, from the farm-loan-bank legislation back in 1917 on to this time, has required study and facts and knowledge. This is the agency from which we get those facts.

The East Indies are lost to us, largely. Now there is a new problem presenting itself with regard to South American agriculture. I could go on indefinitely on this question, but let me read just one sentence on the situation before this cut that is now produced is voted upon. We cut this item, in committee, some \$50,000. I read here from the hearings:

Mr. TARVER. It is noticed that a substantial reduction in the number of your employees will become effective if the Budget Bureau's estimates are approved as contemplated for the next fiscal year. In the fiscal year, for example, it seems that a reduction from 491.6 to 375.6 in the number of permanent field employees contemplated, and in the departmental service there is a reduction of 816.9 to 766.9 contemplated. If these employees are not retained in your department, will they be kept in the Department of Agriculture or will they be dropped from the service?

Dr. TOLLEY. Presumably, they will be dropped from the service.

We made a \$50,000 cut in spite of that fact, and now it is proposed to cut from an item of \$1,278,000 a million dollars.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman must be fair. There is \$3,500,000 here including transfers, leaving them \$2,500,000.

Mr. LEAVY. I grant you that, but this particular service the gentleman is proposing to cut from \$1,278,000-plus to \$278,000. This service does what? It is stated in the bill as follows:

For acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, for conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstration, and for aiding in formulating programs for authorized activities of the Department of Agriculture,

And so forth. This is what the gentleman proposes to reduce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the whole amount is for that purpose.

Mr. LEAVY. I think it would be a grievous mistake to make that reduction. [Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I am in a hard place. I do not know what to do. I am not willing to come into this House and guess how to vote upon an important measure, certainly one of the most important measures I can think of. In the first place, we are in war, and in the next place we are now dealing with the next most important, if not the most important, question connected with the prosecution of the war.

May I address myself to my good friend the chairman of the subcommittee, recalling, if I am correct, and if not, I should like to be corrected, that it was suggested by the chairman that there are probably places in this bill where it would be proper to make certain reductions and effect certain economies. Am I to be left in the position of guessing at that, or what shall I do about it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just let me emphasize that the American Farm Bureau Federation, consisting of farmers that plow the soil and not the paved streets in Washington, favors this amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The committee heard the Farm Bureau Federation representatives for 2 days. They gave us some valuable suggestions, which we adopted. We did not adopt everything that they suggested. I do not believe the Congress would be justified in writing an appropriation bill based solely on the opinions of representatives of the Farm Bureau Federation.

With regard to the gentleman's statement about my statement as to the fact that economies could be effected in this bill if the viewpoint of the committee should be sustained, all that the gentleman has to do is to read the subcommittee's report in which we point out where, if in our judgment we were justified in doing it, some scores of millions of dollars could be cut out of the bill, and ought to be; but in view of the recent action of the Congress in expressly authorizing the appropriations which we thought ought to be cut out, we felt we would be justly charged with disregarding the viewpoint of the Congress if we undertook to do that. If the House wants to cut it out, as far as I am concerned I am in agreement with whatever the House wishes to do on those items. If the gentleman will read the report he will find what the items are.

Mr. FOLGER. I must have misinterpreted what the chairman of the

committee said, because I had looked for him to point out to me a Member who has not read the hearings of the committee and who depends largely and with full confidence on the committee, any places where economies could be effected without injury to the program which is so necessary to the prosecution of the war.

So I am left a little bit at sea as what I ought to do. I want to do the right thing, but I do not want to guess at it. I do not want to put myself in that situation by my vote, and I would like to know if there are any amendments to be offered or suggestions to be made where recognized economies can be made without injuring the farm program.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The gentleman seems to be making an actual inquiry, and I may say to the gentleman that the most controversial sections are those dealing with land tenantry and farm security. We found there the greatest opposition, and they involve millions of dollars. They are the things we naturally thought would be subject to the greatest opposition and were sought to be cut down, I may say in answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. FOLGER. Is there yet something to be done about that?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; that is ahead of us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And such amendments will be submitted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 55, noes 52.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 65, noes 54.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 76, noes 55.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSPECK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6709) the agricultural appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a decision which was requested by the subcommittee and which goes to

the pending bill, relating to certain activities of the Farm Security Administration. I think the membership of the committee should have the benefit of the information contained in this decision, and I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record by publishing this decision.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein excerpts from a recent report of the National Resources Planning Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an article by Inez Robb entitled "What British Women Are Doing To Help Win the War." Mr. Speaker, the article may run a trifle over the amount allowed, although I think not, and I ask permission to include the article notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including therein an address delivered in Oklahoma by the Honorable Ralph Carr, Governor of California. I find, after consulting the Public Printer, that it runs slightly over 2 pages, and the amount is \$112.75. I now renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an excerpt from a broadcast by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., on clothing-contract policies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we have had a very heavy day today in the House, and the lawmakers are tired. The message that I have to address to the House will keep until next Tuesday, and I shall defer that until that time if I can get unanimous consent to address the House on Tuesday next. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of other matters on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.
[Mr. GREEN addressed the House.
His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by printing a letter from the executive secretary of the Railway Labor Executive Association in regard to the pending appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BISHOP, for an indefinite period because of serious illness in his family.

To Mr. DAVIS of Ohio, for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. HANCOCK), for an indefinite period on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 6, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will meet Friday, March 6, at 10:30 a. m., in room 353, House Office Building, to continue hearings on the bill H. R. 6522.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, March 11, 1942, at 10 a. m. subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on H. R. 6444, to provide for the registration of labor organizations, business, and trade associations, and so forth. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1454. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1455. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to the city of Murfreesboro, State of Tennessee, to enable the city to construct and maintain a water pumping station and pipe line; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1456. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to limit the initial base pay of \$21 per month for enlisted men in the Army and Marine Corps to those of the seventh grade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1457. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to \$300,000, for the Lands Division of the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 645); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1458. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 in the aggregate amount of \$3,280,000, together with a provision for a contract authorization in addition thereto in the amount of \$25,400,000 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 646); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1459. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 in the amount of \$100,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 647); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1460. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1942 amounting to \$530,000 (H. Doc. No. 648); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Interim report, Special Committee No. 3 on Materiel, Procurement, and Personnel, pursuant to House Resolution 162, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1696. An act for the relief of Bessie Walden; with amendment (Rept. No. 1855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 1898. An act for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Nazaria Garcia, of Winslow, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1154. A bill for the relief of George C. Dewey; with amendment (Rept. No. 1857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2014. A bill for the relief of Carl L. Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 1858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Silva; with amendment (Rept. No. 1859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4153. A bill for the relief of

Cleaver Kelley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4180. A bill for the relief of Edward Keating; with amendment (Rept. No. 1861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Alice R. Swett; with amendment (Rept. No. 1862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4408. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert S. Swett; with amendment (Rept. No. 1863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4464. A bill for the relief of Henry J. McCloskey; with amendment (Rept. No. 1864). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4796. A bill for the relief of G. C. Barco; with amendment (Rept. No. 1865). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4981. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims against the United States of the Phoenix Construction Associates; with amendment (Rept. No. 1866). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5438. A bill for the relief of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5439. A bill for the relief of Joseph Soulek; with amendment (Rept. No. 1868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5452. A bill for the relief of Emmett Armstrong; with amendment (Rept. No. 1869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5559. A bill for the relief of William Horsman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5596. A bill for the relief of Tommy Huddleston; with amendment (Rept. No. 1871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6714. A bill for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott; without amendment (Rept. No. 1872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 6728. A bill granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain dependents of veterans of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 1874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6728. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain dependents of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 6729. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to establish fees or charges for services performed or publications or forms furnished by the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 6730. A bill to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. J. Res. 288. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 6731. A bill to reinstate John B. Day, a captain, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 6732. A bill granting an increase in pension to Nora T. Gorton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6733. A bill for the relief of Leslie P. Horton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 6734. A bill for the relief of Victor Bonnici; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 6735. A bill for the relief of William Muetz; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2519 By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of residents of Portuguese descent in the city of Providence, R. I., adopted at a mass meeting on March 1, 1942, earnestly endorsing all measures taken by the United States Government to bring to a final success and victory this war for the preservation of democracy and the peace of the world, and pledging absolute loyalty to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2520 By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Prohibition Party of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 in order to preserve law and order amongst the armed services at all times and to enable them to perform their important duties; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2521. By Mr. HAINES: Resolution passed by the Pennsylvania State Senate on March 3, 1942, opposing the proposed erection of the dam on the Clarion River in Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Flood Control.

2522. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the First Baptist Church of Bradford, Pa., proposing to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2523. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Resolution adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders, Bergen County, N. J., opposing the passage of Senate bill 2015 and House bill 5949, the said bills being against the best interests of the county of Bergen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2524. Also, resolution adopted by Hunterdon County Board of Agriculture, Flemington, N. J., petitioning those responsible for assigning quotas for selective service boards to set quotas that selective service will not absorb a large percentage of available farm labor and thus add to the present farm-labor shortage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant us wisdom adequate to know our duty, and, as we hear Thy call, give us will to answer. We praise Thee with grateful hearts that Thy infinite holy nature holds a wide, deep pity which atones, forgives, and saves. Its power and consolation reach around the earth, to those in tears, in sorrow, and even in death.

Thou who are the living bread upon which we must feed, the vine on which there are unwithering branches, and the Good Shepherd who leads the way into green pastures, we pray Thee to be graciously near the mothers and daughters of our country's defenders; they are sacrificial workers in freedom's necessities; their toil is transfigured from labor into a mission both human and divine. We rejoice that men are called not only to be apostles and prophets, but to work for Thee and humanity, glorified by a high and holy purpose, whose sacrifice and hardness do not escape the approving eyes of a good God. We most humbly beseech Thee that calm behaviour may possess our citizens, and do Thou give deliverance from irresponsibility and from all voices full of greedy conflict. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldrige, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the estate of John J. Murray;

H. R. 2120. An act for the relief of John H. Durnell;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of John Huff;

H. R. 4896. An act for the relief of David B. Byrne;

H. R. 5478. An act for the relief of Neil Mahoney; and

H. R. 6531. An act to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of tariff duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous-metal scrap.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 221. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co., the Point Wharf Oyster Co., and B. J. Rooks & Sons.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6511. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6005. An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4557) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. SPENCER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4665) entitled "An act for the relief of Harry Kahn," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5290) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5473) entitled "An act for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2198) entitled "An act to provide for the financing of the War Damage Corporation, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MALONEY, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. DANAHER, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARK-